Margaret Carnegie
Library

Accession No. R 31375

Class 920.042 Book D554
v.17

DICTIONARY

OF

NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

EDWARD——ERSKINE

DICTIONARY

OF

NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

EDITED BY

LESLIE STEPHEN

Mills College Library
WITHDRAWN

VOL. XVII.

EDWARD——ERSKINE

LONDON
SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE
1889

[*All rights reserved*]



R
920.042
D554
v.17

Mills College Library
WITHDRAWN

31375

LIST OF WRITERS

IN THE SEVENTEENTH VOLUME.

J. G. A. . . J. G. Alger.

A. J. A. . . Sir Alexander John Arbuthnot, K.C.S.I.

T. A. A. . . T. A. Archer.

G. F. R. B. G. F. Russell Barker.

T. B. . . . . Thomas Bayne.

W. B. . . . . The Rev. William Benham, B.D., F.S.A.

G. T. B. . . G. T. Bettany.

A. C. B. . . A. C. Bickley.

B. H. B. . . The Rev. B. H. Blacker.

W. G. B. . . The Rev. Professor Blaikie, D.D.

G. C. B. . . G. C. Boase.

G. S. B. . . G. S. Boulger.

A. H. B. . . A. H. Bullen.

H. M. C. . . H. Manners Chichester.

M. C–y. . . . Miller Christy.

T. C. . . . . Thompson Cooper, F.S.A.

W. P. C. . . W. P. Courtney.

L. C. . . . . Lionel Cust.

J. D. . . . . James Dixon, M.D.

J. W. E. . . The Rev. J. W. Ebsworth, F.S.A.

F. E. . . . . Francis Espinasse.

L. F. . . . . Louis Fagan.

J. G. . . . . James Gairdner.

S. R. G. . . S. R. Gardiner, LL.D.

R. G. . . . . Richard Garnett, LL.D.

G. G. . . . . Gordon Goodwin.

A. G. . . . . The Rev. Alexander Gordon.

J. A. H. . . J. A. Hamilton.

R. H. . . . . Robert Harrison.

W. J. H. . . Professor W. Jerome Harrison.

T. F. H. . . T. F. Henderson.

J. H. . . . . Miss Jennett Humphreys.

R. H–t. . . . The late Robert Hunt, F.R.S.

W. H. . . . The Rev. William Hunt.

B. D. J. . . B. D. Jackson.

A. J. . . . . The Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D.D.

R. J. J. . . . The Rev. R. Jenkin Jones.

H. G. K. . . H. G. Keene, C.I.E.

C. K. . . . . Charles Kent.

J. K. . . . . Joseph Knight.

J. K. L. . . Professor J. K. Laughton.

S. L. L. . . S. L. Lee.

W. B. L. . . The Rev. W. B. Lowther.

H. R. L. . . The Rev. H. R. Luard, D.D.

J. A. F. M. J. A. Fuller Maitland.

L. M. M. . . Miss Middleton.

N. M. . . . . Norman Moore, M.D.

T. O. . . . . The Rev. Thomas Olden.

N. D. F. P. N. D. F. Pearce.

R. L. P. . . R. L. Poole.

S. L.-P. . . . Stanley Lane-Poole.

J. M. R. . . J. M. Rigg.

C. J. R. . . . The Rev. C. J. Robinson.
L. C. S. . . Lloyd C. Sanders.
J. M. S. . . J. M. Scott.
G. B. S. . . G. Barnett Smith.
L. S. . . . . Leslie Stephen.
H. M. S. . . H. Morse Stephens.
C. W. S. . . C. W. Sutton.
H. R. T. . . H. R. Tedder.
T. F. T. . . Professor T. F. Tout.
R. H. V. . . Lieut.-Colonel Vetch, R.E.
A. V. . . . . Alsager Vian.
A. W. W. . . Professor A. W. Ward, LL.D.
M. G. W. . . The Rev. M. G. Watkins.
F. W–T. . . Francis Watt.
C. W–H. . . Charles Welch.
W. W. . . . Warwick Wroth.

DICTIONARY

OF

NATIONAL BIOGRAPHY

EDWARD, EADWARD, or **EADWEARD,** called THE ELDER (*d.* 924), king of the Angles and Saxons, the elder son of King Ælfred and Ealhswyth, was brought up most carefully at his father's court with Ælfthryth, his sister, who was next above him in age; they were both beloved by all, and were educated as became their rank, learning psalms and English poetry and reading English books (ASSER, p. 485). Eadward distinguished himself in his father's later wars with the Danes, and the taking of the Danish camp on the Colne and the victory at Buttington in 894 are attributed to him (ÆTHELWEARD, p. 518). Although he had no special part of the kingdom assigned to him, he bore the title of king in 898, probably as his father's assistant (KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 324). He was, we are told, as good a soldier as his father, but not so good a scholar (FLOR. WIG.) On Ælfred's death, which took place on 28 Oct. 901, he was chosen by the 'witan' to succeed to the kingdom (ÆTHELWEARD, p. 519), and was crowned on the Whitsunday following. His succession was disputed by one of his cousins, the ætheling Æthelwald, a son of Æthelred, the fourth son of Æthelwulf, who seized on two of the king's vills, Wimborne in Dorsetshire and Twynham (Christ Church) in Hampshire. The king led an army against him and encamped at Badbury, near Wimborne, but Æthelwald shut himself up in the town with his men and declared that he would 'either live there or lie there' (*A.-S. Chron.*) Nevertheless he escaped by night, and went to the Danes in Northumbria, who received him as king. Eadward entered Wimborne and sent the lady with whom Æthelwald lived back to her nunnery, for she had taken the veil before she joined her lover. For two or three years after this Eadward seems to have reigned in peace, save that there was some fighting between the Kentishmen and the Danes. Meanwhile Æthelwald was preparing to attack the kingdom, and in 904 he came to Essex from 'over sea' with a fleet that he had purchased, received the submission of the people, and obtained more ships from them. With these he sailed the next year to East Anglia and persuaded the Danes to join him in an invasion of Mercia. They overran the country, and even entered Wessex, crossing the Thames at Cricklade in Wiltshire, and then ravaged as far as Bredon in Worcestershire. Eadward retaliated by laying waste the western districts of East Anglia, and then ordered his army to return. The Kentishmen refused to obey the order, and waited to give battle to the Danes. A fierce conflict took place, and the Danes kept the battle-ground, but they lost more men than the English, and among the slain was the ætheling Æthelwald. His death put an end to the war. The next year (906) the peace which Ælfred had made with Guthrum-Æthelstan was renewed at Eadward's dictation at Ittingford, and he and the Danish under-king of East Anglia, Guthrum Eohricsson, joined in putting out laws which, though binding both on the English and the Danes, expressly recognised and confirmed the differences between the usages of the two peoples, though, indeed, these differences were very superficial (THORPE, *Ancient Laws*, p. 71).

The death of Æthelwald delivered Eadward from a dangerous rival, and enabled him, as soon as opportunity offered, to enter on his great work, the widening and strengthening of his immediate kingdom and the reduction of princes who reigned beyond its borders to a condition of dependence. He styled himself in his charters 'Angul-Saxonum rex,' treating the two races over which he reigned as one people. The treaty of 878

had left his house the kingship of the western half of the Mercian Angles and of the Saxons of the south; his father had ruled over both as separate peoples; he, though as yet there was little if any fusion between them, seems to have marked by this change in the royal style his intention to treat them as one (GREEN, *Conquest of England*, p. 192). At the same time an important political distinction existed between them, for the Mercians were still governed by their own ealdorman, descended probably from the line of ancient Mercian kings. This, however, proved to be a source of strength rather than of weakness, for the ealdorman Æthelred had married the king's sister Æthelflæd [see ETHELFLEDA], and Eadward owed much of the prosperity of his reign to this marriage, and much too to the fact that no son was born of it to carry on the old line of separate, though now dependent, rulers.

The first measure of defence against Danish attacks was taken by Æthelred and his wife, who in 907 'restored,' that is fortified and colonised, Chester, and thus gained a port that might be used by ships employed in keeping off invasion by the Irish Ostmen, and established a stronghold commanding the Dee. In 910 Eadward was again at war with the Danes; they seem to have broken the peace, and in return an army of West-Saxons and Mercians ravaged Northumbria for the space of forty days. A battle was fought on 6 Aug. at Tettenhall in Staffordshire, where the Danes were defeated. Then Eadward went into Kent to gather his fleet together, for the Northmen infested the Channel, and he bade a hundred ships and their crews meet him there, so well had his father's work in naval organisation prospered. While he was in Kent in 911 the Northmen, reckoning that he had no other force at his disposal beyond that in his ships (*A.-S. Chron.*), again broke the peace, and, refusing to listen to the terms offered them by the king and the 'witan,' swept over the whole of Mercia to the Avon, and there embarked, no doubt in ships from Ireland, and did some damage to Wessex as they sailed on the Severn (ÆTHELWEARD, p. 519). They were stoutly resisted by the levy of those parts, and sustained much loss. Eadward's army, composed of both West-Saxons and Mercians, defeated them at Wodensfield in Staffordshire, with the loss of their two kings, Halfdan and Ecwils, and many of their principal men. In the course of this or of the next year the ealdorman Æthelred died, and Eadward gave the ealdormanship of Mercia to his widow Æthelflæd. At the same time he annexed London and Oxford, 'with all the lands which belonged thereto' (*A.-S. Chron.*), he detached them from the Mercian ealdormanry, and definitely united them to the West-Saxon land. After the accession of Æthelflæd as sole ruler, with the title of the Lady of the Mercians, she carried on with extraordinary vigour the work, already begun during her husband's life, of guarding her dominions from attack by building 'burhs' or fortified settlements at different points of strategic importance, such as Tamworth and Stafford [see under ETHELFLEDA]. Meanwhile Eadward pursued a similar policy in the south-east. No longer waiting for the Danes to attack him, he advanced his border by building two burhs at Hertford to hold the passage of the Lea, and then marched into Essex and encamped at Maldon, while his men fortified Witham on the Blackwater. He thus added a good portion of Essex to his dominions, and 'much folk submitted to him that were before under the power of the Danish men' (*ib.*) Then, perhaps, followed a period of rest as far as Eadward and the West-Saxons were concerned, though Æthelflæd still went on with her work, securing the Mercian border against the Danes and the Welsh. In 915 Eadward was suddenly called on to defend his land from foreign invasion, for a viking fleet from Brittany under two jarls sailed into the Severn, attacked the Welsh, and took the Bishop of Llandaff prisoner. Eadward ransomed the bishop, and sent a force to guard the coast of Somerset. The Northmen landed, and were defeated with great loss by the levies of Gloucester and Hereford; they then made attempts to land at Watchet and Porlock in Somerset, but were beaten off. Some landed on one of the Holms in the Bristol Channel, and many of them died of hunger on the island. Finally the remainder of them sailed away to Ireland. Later in the year Eadward began to advance his border in a new direction, and attacked the Danish settlements on the Ouse; he took Buckingham after a siege of four weeks, and raised fortifications there. Then the jarl Thurcytel, who held Bedford, and all the chief men there, and many of those who belonged to the settlement of Northampton, submitted to him.

From the submission of Thurcytel, which should probably be placed under 915 (*A.-S. Chron.*, Mercian; FLORENCE; under 918, according to *A.-S. Chron.*, Winton, followed by GREEN), the chronology of the reign is very confused. In this attempt to deal with it, as far as seems necessary for the present purpose, the Mercian has for obvious reasons been preferred to the Winchester version of the 'Chronicle,' considerable weight has been given to Florence of Worcester, and the deaths of Æthelflæd in 918 and Eadward in 924 have

been assumed as settled. After receiving the submission of Thurcytel and his 'holds,' Eadward went to Bedford early in November, stayed there a month, and fortified it with a 'burh' on the southern side of the river. After a while Thurcytel and his Danes, finding that England was no place for them under such a king, obtained his leave to take ship and depart to 'Frankland.' Eadward restored Maldon and put a garrison there, perhaps in 917 (*A.-S. Chron.*, Winton, 920; FLORENCE, 918), and the next year advanced to Towcester, built a 'burh' there, and ordered the fortification of Wigmore in Herefordshire. Then a vigorous effort was made by the Danes of Mercia and East Anglia to recover the ground they had lost. They besieged Towcester, Bedford, and Wigmore, but in each case were beaten off. A great host, partly from Huntingdon and partly from East Anglia, raised a 'work' at Tempsford as a point of attack on the English line of the Ouse, leaving Huntingdon deserted. This army was defeated, with the loss of the Danish king of East Anglia and many others, and an attack made on Maldon by the East Angles, in alliance with a viking fleet, was also foiled. Finally Eadward compelled the jarl Thurferth and the Danes of Northampton 'to seek him for father and lord,' and fortified Huntingdon and Colchester. The year was evidently a critical one; the struggle ended in the complete victory of the English king, who received the submission of the Danes of East Anglia, Essex, and Cambridge.

Meanwhile the Lady of the Mercians had, after some trouble, compelled the Welsh to keep the peace, and had then turned against the Danes of the Five Boroughs, subduing Derby and Leicester. She lived to hear that the people of York had submitted to her, and then died at Tamworth on 12 June 918 [on this date see under ETHELFLEDA]. Her vigorous policy had done much to forward the success of her brother. Between them they had succeeded in setting up a line of strongly fortified places which guarded all the approaches from the north from the Blackwater to the Lea, from the Lea to the Ouse, and from the Ouse to the Dee and the Mersey. Eadward was completing the reduction of the Fen country by the fortification of Stamford, when he heard of her death. He reduced Nottingham, another of the Five Boroughs, and caused it to be fortified afresh and colonised partly by Englishmen and partly by Danes. This brought the reconquest of the Mercian Danelaw to a triumphant close, and Eadward now took a step by which the people of English Mercia, as well as of the newly conquered district, were brought into immediate dependence on the English king. Æthelflæd's daughter Ælfwyn was, it is said, sought in marriage by Sihtric, the Danish king of York (CARADOC, p. 47). This marriage would have given all the dominions that Æthelflæd had acquired, and all the vast influence which she exercised, into the hands of the Danes. Eadward therefore would not allow Ælfwyn to succeed to her mother's power, and in 919 carried her away into Wessex. The notice of this measure given by Henry of Huntingdon probably preserves the feelings of anger and regret with which the Mercians saw the extinction of the remains of their separate political existence. The ancient Mercian realm was now fully incorporated with Wessex, and all the people in the Mercian land, Danes as well as English, submitted to Eadward. A most important step was thus accomplished in the union of the kingdom.

The death of Æthelflæd appears to have roused the Danes to fresh activity; Sihtric made a raid into Cheshire (SYMEON, an. 920), and a body of Norwegians from Ireland, who had perhaps been allowed by Æthelflæd to colonise the country round Chester, laid siege to, and possibly took, the town ('urbem Legionum,' *Gesta Regum*, § 133. Mr. Green appears to take this as Leicester, and to believe that the passage refers to the raid of the Danes from Northampton and Leicester on Towcester, placed by the Winchester chronicler under 921, and by Florence, followed in the text, under 918. The help that the pagans received from the Welsh makes it almost certain that William of Malmesbury records a war at Chester, and possibly the siege that in the 'Fragment' of MacFirbisigh is assigned to the period of the last illness of the Mercian ealdorman Æthelred; see under ETHELFLEDA). Eadward recovered the city, and received the submission of the Welsh, 'for the kings of the North Welsh and all the North Welsh race sought him for lord.' He now turned to a fresh enterprise; he desired to close the road from Northumbria into Middle England that gave Manchester its earliest importance, as well as to prepare for an attack on York, where a certain Ragnar had been received as king. Accordingly he fortified and colonised Thelwall, and sent an army to take Manchester in Northumbria, to renew its walls and to man them. This completed the line of fortresses which began with Chester, and he next set about connecting it with the strong places he had gained in the district of the Five Boroughs, for he strengthened Nottingham and built a 'burh' at Bakewell in Peakland, which commanded the Derwent standing about midway between Manchester and Derby. After recording how he placed

a garrison in Bakewell, the Winchester chronicler adds: 'And him there chose to father and to lord the Scot king and all the Scot people, and Regnald, and Eadulf's son, and all that dwelt in Northumbria, whether Englishmen, or Danish, or Northmen, or other, and eke the king of the Strathclyde Welsh and all the Strathclyde Welsh' (an. 924, *A.-S. Chron.*, Winton; but this is certainly too late, and 921 seems a better date; comp. Flor. Wig.) In these words the most brilliant writer on the reign finds evidence of a forward march of the king, of a formidable northern league formed to arrest his progress, of the submission of the allies, and of a visit to the English camp, probably at Dore, in which 'the motley company of allies' owned Eadward as their lord (*Conquest of England*, pp. 216, 217). While there is nothing improbable in all this, the picture is without historical foundation. It is best not to go beyond what is written, especially as there is some ground for believing that the 'entry cannot be contemporary' (*ib.*) We may, however, safely accept it as substantially correct. Its precise meaning has been strenuously debated, for it was used by Edward I as the earliest precedent on which he based his claim to the allegiance of the Scottish crown (Hemingburgh, ii. 198). Dr. Freeman attaches extreme importance to it as conveying the result, in the case of Scotland, of 'a solemn national act,' from which may be dated the 'permanent superiority' of the English crown (*Norman Conquest*, i. 60, 128, 610). On the other hand, it is slighted by Robertson (*Scotland under her Early Kings*, ii. 384 sq.) It must clearly be interpreted by the terms used of other less important submissions. When the kings made their submission they entered into exactly the same relationship to the English king as that which had been entered into by the jarl Thurferth and his army when they sought Eadward 'for their lord and protector.' They found the English king too strong for them, and rather than fight him they 'commended' themselves to him, and entered into his 'peace.' The tie thus created was personal, and was analogous to that which existed between the lord and his *comitatus*. It marked the preponderating power of Eadward, but in itself it should perhaps scarcely be held as more than 'an episode in the struggle for supremacy in the north' (Green). Eadward thus succeeded in carrying the bounds of his immediate kingdom as far north as the Humber, and in addition to this was owned by all other kings and their peoples in the island as their superior.

In the midst of his wars he found time for some important matters of civil and ecclesiastical administration. Two civil developments of this period were closely connected with his wars. The conquest of the Danelaw and the extinction of the Mercian ealdormanry appear to have led to the extension of the West-Saxon system of shire-division to Mercia. While it is not probable that this system was carried out at all generally even in Mercia till after Eadward's death, the beginning of it may at least be traced to his reign, and appears in the annexation of London and Oxford with their subject lands Middlesex and Oxfordshire. Another change, the increase of the personal dignity of the king and the acceptance of a new idea of the duty of the subject, is also connected with conquest. The conquered Danes still remained outside the English people, they had no share in the old relationship between the race and the king, they made their submission to the king personally, and placed themselves under his personal protection. Thus the king's dignity was increased, and a new tie, that of personal loyalty, first to be observed in the laws of Ælfred, was strengthened as regards all his people. Accordingly, at a witenagemot held at Exeter, Eadward proposed that all 'should be in that fellowship that he was, and love that which he loved, and shun that which he shunned, both on sea and land.' The loyalty due from the dwellers in the Danelaw was demanded of all alike. The idea of the public peace was gradually giving place to that of the king's peace. Other laws of Eadward concern the protection of the buyer, the administration of justice, and the like. In these, too, there may be discerned the increase of the royal pre-eminence. The law-breaker is for the first time said to incur the guilt of 'oferhyrnes' towards the king; in breaking the law he had shown 'contempt' of the royal authority (Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, pp. 68–75; Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, i. 175, 183). In ecclesiastical affairs Eadward seems to have been guided by his father's advisers. He kept Grimbold with him and, at his instance it is said, completed the 'New Minster,' Ælfred's foundation at Winchester, and endowed it largely (*Liber de Hyda*, 111; *Ann. Winton.* 10). Asser appears to have resided at his court (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 335, 337), and he evidently acted cordially with Archbishop Plegmund. The increase he made in the episcopate in southern England is connected with a story told by William of Malmesbury, who says (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 129) that in 904 the West-Saxon bishoprics had lain vacant for seven years, and that Pope Formosus wrote threatening Eadward and his people with excommunication for their neglect, that the

king then held a synod over which Plegmund presided, that the two West-Saxon dioceses were divided into five, and that Plegmund consecrated seven new bishops in one day. As it stands this story must be rejected, for Formosus died in 896. Still it is true that in 909 the sees of Winchester, Sherborne, and South-Saxon Selsey were all vacant, and that Eadward and Plegmund separated Wiltshire and Berkshire from the see of Winchester and formed them into the diocese of Ramsbury, and made Somerset and Devonshire, which lay in the bishopric of Sherborne, two separate dioceses, with their sees at Wells and Crediton. Five West-Saxon bishops and two bishops for Selsey and Dorchester were therefore consecrated by Plegmund, possibly at the same time (*Anglia Sacra*, i. 554; *Reg. Sac. Anglic.* 13).

The 'Unconquered King,' as Florence of Worcester calls him, died at Farndon in Northamptonshire in 924, in the twenty-fourth year of his reign (*A.-S. Chron.*, Worcester; Florence; Symeon; 925 *A.-S. Chron.*, Winton). As Æthelstan calls 929 the sixth year of his reign (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 347, 348), it is obvious that Eadward must have died in 924, and there are some reasons for believing that he died in the August of that year (*Memorials of Dunstan*, introd. lxxiv *n.*) He was buried in the 'New Minster' of Winchester. By Ecgwyn, a lady of high rank (Flor. Wig.), or, according to later and untrustworthy tradition, a shepherd's daughter (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 131, 139; *Liber de Hyda*, 111), who seems to have been his concubine, he had his eldest son Æthelstan, who succeeded him, possibly a son named Ælfred, not the rebel ætheling of the next reign, and a daughter Eadgyth, who in the year of her father's death was given in marriage by her brother to Sihtric, the Danish king of Northumbria. By 901 he was married to Ælflæd, daughter of Æthelhelm, one of his thegns, and Ealhswith (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 333). She bore him Ælfweard, who is said to have been learned, and who died sixteen days after his father, and probably Eadwine, drowned at sea in 933 (*A.-S. Chron.* sub an.), possibly by order of his brother (Symeon, *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 686; *Gesta Regum*, § 139), though the story, especially in its later and fuller form, is open to doubt (Freeman, *Hist. Essays*, i. 10–15), and six daughters: Æthelflæd, a nun perhaps at Wilton (*Gesta Regum*, iii. 126) or at Rumsey (*Liber de Hyda*, 112); Eadgifu, married in 919 by her father to Charles the Simple, and after his death to Herbert, count of Troyes, in 951 (*Acta SS. Bolland.* Mar. xii. 750); Æthelhild, a nun at Wilton; Eadhild, married by her brother to Hugh the Great, count of Paris; Ælfgifu, called in France Adela, married about 936 to Eblus, son of the count of Aquitaine (Richard. Pict., Bouquet, ix. 21); Eadgyth or Edith, married in 930 to Otto, afterwards emperor, and died on 26 Jan. 947, after her husband became king, but before he became emperor, deeply regretted by all the Saxon people (Widukind, i. 37, ii. 41). Eadward's second wife (or third, if Ecgwyn is reckoned) was Eadgifu, by whom he had Eadmund and Eadred, who both came to the throne, and two daughters, Eadburh or Edburga, a nun at Winchester, of whose precocious piety William of Malmesbury tells a story (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 217), and Eadgifu, married to Lewis, king of Arles or Provence. Besides these, he is said to have had a son called Gregory, who went to Rome, became a monk, and afterwards abbot of Einsiedlen.

[Anglo-Saxon Chron. sub ann.; Florence of Worcester, sub ann. (Engl. Hist. Soc.); William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum, §§ 112, 124–6, 129, 131, 139 (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Gesta Pontificum, 177, 395 (Rolls Ser.); Henry of Huntingdon, 742, Mon. Hist. Brit.; Symeon of Durham, 686, Mon. Hist. Brit.; Æthelweard, 519, Mon. Hist. Brit.; Liber de Hyda, 111, 112 (Rolls Ser.); Annales Winton. 10 (Rolls Ser.); Thorpe's Ancient Laws and Institutes, 68–75; Kemble's Codex Dipl. ii. 138–49; Three Irish Fragments by Dubhaltach MacFirbisigh, ed. O'Donovan (Irish Archæol. and Celtic Soc.); Widukind's Res Gestæ Saxonicæ, i. 37, ii. 41, Pertz; Caradoc's Princes of Wales, 47; Recueil des Historiens, Bouquet, ix. 21; Stubbs's Constitutional Hist. i. 176, 183, and Registrum Sacrum Anglic. 13; Freeman's Norman Conquest, i. 58–61, 610; Robertson's Scotland under her Early Kings, ii. 384 sq.; Green's Conquest of England, 189–215—the best account we have of the wars of Eadward and Æthelflæd; Lappenberg's Anglo-Saxon Kings (Thorpe), ii. 85 sq.] W. H.

EDWARD or **EADWARD** the Martyr (963?–978), king of the English, the eldest son of Eadgar, was the child of Æthelflæd, and was born probably in 963 [see under Eadgar]. He was brought up as his father's heir, his education was entrusted to Sideman, bishop of Crediton, who instructed him in the scriptures, and he grew a stout and hardy lad (*Vita S. Oswaldi*, p. 449). He was about twelve years old when his father died in 975. The circumstances of his election to the throne will be found in the article on Dunstan. It should be added that the author of the 'Life of St. Oswald,' writing before 1005, says that the nobles who opposed his election were moved to do so by his hot temper, for the boy used not only to abuse but to beat his attendants. While it is likely enough that he was imperious and quick-tem-

pered, the faction that, at the instigation of Eadgar's widow, Ælfthryth, upheld the claim made on behalf of her son was of course swayed by other considerations. A notice of the meetings of the 'witan,' held to settle the dispute between the seculars and regulars, which constitutes the sole interest of this short reign, will also be found under DUNSTAN. It is evident that the monastic party was far less powerful under Eadward than it had been in the time of his father. Dunstan seems to have retained his influence at the court, though the East-Anglian party headed by Æthelwine certainly lost ground, and there is reason to believe that Ælfhere the Mercian ealdorman had the chief hand in the management of affairs. The banishment of Oslac, whom Eadgar had made Earl of Deiran Northumbria, is perhaps evidence of an intention to undo the policy of the last reign by attempting to bring the Danes of the north into more immediate dependence on the crown. Eadward was assassinated on 18 March 978. According to the earliest detailed account of the murder (*ib.*) the thegns of the faction that had upheld the claim put forward on behalf of his half-brother Æthelred plotted to take away his life, and decided on doing so on one of his visits to the child. On the evening of his murder he rode to Corfe, or Corfes-gate, as it was then called, from the gap in which the town stands, in Dorsetshire, where Æthelred was living with his mother Ælfthryth. He had few attendants with him, and the thegns, evidently of Ælfthryth's household and party, came out with their arms in their hands, and crowded round him as though to do him honour. Among them was the cup-bearer ready to do his office. One of them seized the king's hand, and pulled him towards him as though to kiss him—the kiss of the traitor may be an embellishment, for the salute would surely not have been offered by a subject—while another seized his left hand. The young king cried, 'What are ye doing, breaking my right hand?' and as he leaped from his horse the conspirator on his left stabbed him, and he fell dead. His corpse was taken to a poor cottage at Wareham, and was there buried without honour and in unconsecrated ground. The murder excited great indignation, which was increased when it became evident that the king's kinsmen would not avenge him. 'No worse deed was done since the English race first sought Britain,' wrote the chronicler. In 980 Archbishop Dunstan and Ælfhere, the heads of the rival ecclesiastical parties, went to Wareham and joined in translating the body with great pomp to Shaftesbury. There many miracles were wrought at the king's tomb, and great crowds resorted to kneel before it. Eadward was reverenced as a saint and martyr. He was officially styled martyr as early as 1001 (KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 706), and the observance of his mass-day was ordered by the 'witan' in 1008 (THORPE), a law that was re-enacted by Cnut at Winchester (*ib.*) Political feelings can scarcely have had anything to do with the murder of a king whose burial rites were performed by Dunstan and Ælfhere in common. Although the biographer of St. Oswald says nothing of Ælfthryth, it is evident from his account of the murder that it was done not by any of the great nobles, but by the thegns of her household, and his silence as to her name is accounted for by the fact that she may have been alive when the biographer wrote between 990 and 1005, for she seems to have died after 999 and before 1002, and that he wrote in the reign of her son Æthelred. Osbern, writing about 1090, is the first plainly to attribute the murder to Eadward's step-mother (*Memorials of Dunstan*, p. 114), and he is followed by Eadmer (*ib.* 215). Florence (i. 145) says that he was slain by his own men by Ælfthryth's order. Henry of Huntingdon, while attributing his death to men of his own family, mentions the legend that tells how Ælfthryth stabbed him as she handed him a cup of drink (748). This legend is elaborately related by William of Malmesbury (*Gesta Regum*, i. 258). The fact that his body, hastily as it was interred, was buried at Wareham gives some probability to the story that he was dragged for some distance by the stirrup. The deep feeling aroused by his death seems to show that the young king was personally popular, and the affection he showed for his half-brother and the story of the child's grief at his death are perhaps evidences of a loveable nature. Osbern's remarks on the general good opinion men had of him should not, however, be pressed, for Eadward's character had then long been removed from criticism. One charter of Eadward dated 977 is undoubtedly genuine (KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 611).

[Vita S. Oswaldi, Historians of York, i. 448–52 (Rolls Ser.); Adelard, Osbern, Eadmer, Memorials of St. Dunstan, 61, 114, 215 (Rolls Ser.); Anglo-Saxon Chron. sub ann. 975–80; Florence of Worcester, i. 145 (Engl. Hist. Soc.); William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum, i. 258 (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Henry of Huntingdon, Mon. Hist. Brit. 748; Thorpe's Ancient Laws, i. 308, 358; Kemble's Codex Diplomaticus, 611, 706; Robertson's Historical Essays in connection with the Land, the Church, &c., 169; Freeman's Norman Conquest, i. 288–93, 341, 365, 684; Green's Conquest of England, 353–7.] W. H.

EDWARD or **EADWARD**, called THE CONFESSOR (*d.* 1066), king of the English, the elder son of Æthelred the Unready by his marriage in 1002 with Emma, daughter of Richard the Fearless, duke of the Normans, was born at Islip in Oxfordshire (KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 862), and was presented by his parents upon the altar of the monastery of Ely, where it is said that he passed his early years and learnt to sing psalms with the boys of the monastery school (*Liber Eliensis*, ii. c. 91). When Swend was acknowledged king, in 1013, Emma fled to Normandy to the court of her brother, Richard the Good, and shortly afterwards Æthelred sent Eadward and his younger brother Ælfred [q. v.] to join her there under the care of Ælfhun, bishop of London. On Swend's death, in February 1014, Eadward and his mother were sent to England by Æthelred in company with the ambassadors who came over to ascertain whether the 'witan' would again receive him as king. When Æthelred was restored to his kingdom he left Eadward and his brother to be educated at the Norman court, where they were treated with the honour due to their birth (WILL. OF JUMIÈGES, vi. 10). Towards the end of Cnut's reign, Duke Robert asserted their right to the throne, and Eadward set sail with the duke from Fécamp to invade England; the wind drove the Norman fleet to Jersey and the enterprise was abandoned (*ib.*; WACE, l. 7897 sq.; *Gesta Regum*, ii. 180). The assertion of William of Jumièges that Cnut soon afterwards offered half his kingdom to the æthelings may safely be disregarded. In 1036, when Cnut was dead, and Harold ruled over the northern part of England, while Harthacnut, though still in Denmark, reigned probably as an under-king over Wessex, the æthelings made an attempt to enforce their claim. Eadward is said to have sailed with forty ships, to have landed at Southampton, and to have defeated a force of English with great loss (WILL. OF POITIERS, p. 78). He probably sailed in company with his brother, and stayed at Winchester, where his mother dwelt, while Ælfred tried to reach London. When the news came of his brother's overthrow and death, Emma is said to have helped him to leave the kingdom in safety (FLOR. WIG. i. 191–2; KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 824, doubtful). He returned to England in 1041, probably at the invitation of his half-brother Harthacnut, then sole king, who was childless, and, though young, was in weak health. Several Normans and Frenchmen of high birth accompanied him, and chief among them his nephew Ralph, son of his sister Godgifu and Drogo of Mantes (*Vita Eadwardi*, l. 335; *Historia Ramesiensis*, p. 171). The king received him with honour, and he took up his abode at court, though the story that he was invited by Harthacnut to share the kingship with him can scarcely be true (*Encomium Emmæ*, iii. 13; SAXO, p. 202).

At the time of Harthacnut's death, in June 1042, Eadward appears to have been in Normandy (*Vita*, l. 196; WILL. OF POITIERS, p. 85). Nevertheless, he was chosen king at London, even before his predecessor was buried. This election was evidently not held to be final, and was probably made by the Londoners without the concurrence of the 'witan' (on the circumstances attending Eadward's election and coronation see *Norman Conquest*, ii. 517 sq.) Negotiations appear to have passed between Eadward and Earl Godwine, the most powerful noble in the kingdom, who was perhaps anxious to prevent him from bringing over a force of Normans (HENRY OF HUNTINGDON, p. 759), and these negotiations were no doubt forwarded by the Norman Duke William, though it is not necessary to believe that Eadward owed his crown to the duke's interference, and to the fear that the English had of his power. Godwine and other earls and certain bishops brought him over from Normandy, and on his arrival in England a meeting of the 'witan' was held at Gillingham. According to Dr. Freeman this was the Wiltshire Gillingham, for the meeting was, he holds, directly followed by the coronation at Winchester. On the other hand, Eadward's biographer speaks of a coronation at Canterbury, and as a contemporary writing for the king's widow can scarcely be mistaken on such a point, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that this was the Gillingham in Kent. Some opposition was raised in the assembly to Eadward's candidature, probably by a Danish party which upheld the claim of Swend Estrithson, the nephew of Cnut (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 197; ADAM OF BREMEN, ii. 74). Although Godwine, both as the husband of Swend's aunt Gytha and as the trusted minister of Cnut, must naturally have been inclined to the Danish cause, he must have seen that the nation was set on the restoration of the line of native kings, for he put himself at the head of Eadward's supporters, and by his eloquence and authority joined with a certain amount of bribery secured his election, the few who remained obstinate being noted for future punishment. Eadward received the crown and was enthroned in Christ Church, Canterbury, and then, if this attempt to construct a consecutive narrative is correct, at once proceeded to Winchester, where it was customary for the king to wear his crown and hold a great

assembly every Easter. There, on Easter day, 3 April 1043, he was solemnly crowned by Eadsige, archbishop of Canterbury, assisted by Ælfric of York and other bishops, Eadsige exhorting him as to the things that were for his and for his people's good (*Anglo-Saxon Chron.*) The opposition to his election and the subsequent punishment of the leaders of the Danish party have been made the basis of a fable, which represents the English as rising against the Danes at the death of Harthacnut, and expelling them from the kingdom by force of arms (Brompton, col. 934; Knighton, col. 2326). At Winchester Eadward received ambassadors from the German king Henry, afterwards the Emperor Henry III, his brother-in-law, who sent them to congratulate him, to bring him presents, and to make alliance with him. Henry, king of the French, also sought his alliance, and Magnus of Norway, who was now engaged in making himself master of Denmark, is said to have taken him for 'father,' and bound himself to him by oaths, while the great vassals of these kings are also described as doing him homage (*Vita*, l. 205 sq.) As regards Magnus and the nobles of other kingdoms it is probable that the biographer has exaggerated, though just at that moment the Norwegian king may well have made some effort to secure the friendship of England. In the following November Eadward, by the advice of the three chief earls of the kingdom, seized on the vast treasures of his mother, Emma, and shortly afterwards deprived Stigand, her chaplain and counsellor, of his bishopric. The reason of these acts was that Emma 'had done less for him than he would before he was king, and also since then' (*A.-S. Chron.*); since her marriage with Cnut she had thrown in her lot with the fortunes of the Danish dynasty, had now probably refused to assist the party of Eadward, and may even have espoused the cause of Swend. Her fall was followed by the banishment of several of the leading Danes. Of the three earls, Godwine, earl of Wessex, Leofric of Mercia, and Siward of Northumbria, who virtually divided England between them, Godwine was the ablest and most powerful. The king was bound to him as the main agent in setting him on the throne, and on 23 Jan. 1045 married his daughter Eadgyth [see Edith, *d.* 1075].

Eadward is described as of middle stature and kingly mien; his hair and his beard were of snowy whiteness, his face was plump and ruddy, and his skin white; he was doubtless an albino. His manners were affable and gracious, and while he bore himself majestically in public, he used in private, though never undignified, to be sociable with his courtiers. Although he was sometimes moved to great wrath he abstained from using abusive words. Unlike his countrymen generally he was moderate in eating and drinking, and though at festivals he wore the rich robes his queen worked for him, he did not care for them, for he was free from personal vanity. He was charitable, compassionate, and devout, and during divine service always behaved with a decorum then unusual among kings, for he very seldom talked unless some one asked him a question (*Vita*). That he desired the good of his people there can be no question; but it is equally certain that he took little pains to secure it. His virtues would have adorned the cloister, his failings ill became a throne. The regrets of his people when under the harsh rule of foreigners and the saintship with which he was invested after his death have to some extent thrown a veil over his defects; but he was certainly indolent and neglectful of his kingly duties (Ailred, col. 388; *Gesta Regum*, ii. 196; Saxo, p. 203). The division of the kingdom into great earldoms hindered the exercise of the royal power, and he willingly left the work of government to others. At every period of his reign he was under the influence and control, either of men who had gained power almost independently of him, or of his personal favourities. These favourites were chosen with little regard to their deserts, and were mostly foreigners; for his long residence in Normandy made him prefer Normans to Englishmen. Besides those who came over with him in the reign of Harthacnut, many others also came hither after he was made king. When he was at Winchester, at the time of his coronation he sent gifts to the French (Norman) nobles, and to some of them granted yearly pensions. Save as regards ecclesiastical preferments, the influence of Earl Godwine appears to have been strong enough at first to keep the foreigners at the court simply in the position of personal favourites, but after a while the king promoted them to offices in the state, as well as in the church. The court was the scene of perpetual intrigues, and, slothful as he was, Eadward seems to have taken part in these manœuvres. Apart from his share in them he did little except in ecclesiastical matters. He favoured monasticism, and gave much to monasteries both at home and abroad. Foreign churchmen were always sure to gain wealth if they came to this country, as they often did, on a begging expedition, and to receive preferment if they stayed here. Bishoprics were now as a rule virtually at the king's disposal, and Eadward certainly did not endeavour to appoint the best men to them. In this matter, as in all else, he was

often guided by his partiality for his favourites, or by some court intrigue. The first intrigue of this kind was carried out by Godwine, who in 1044, with the king's co-operation, arranged the appointment of a coadjutor-archbishop of Canterbury, in order to secure the position of his adherent Eadsige [q. v.] Although Eadward was probably not personally guilty of simony, he made no effort to prevent others from practising it; and this evil, which did the greatest mischief to the church, and against which vigorous efforts were now being made in other lands, was shamefully prevalent here during his reign, and was carried on by those who were most trusted by him. His alleged refusal to avail himself of marital privileges, which is dwelt on with special unction by his monastic admirers, is not distinctly asserted either by the writers of the 'Chronicle,' or by Florence, or by the king's contemporary biographer. It is spoken of, though only as a matter of report, by William of Jumièges, and was generally believed in the twelfth century. The concurrence of the queen is asserted by Æthelred (Ailred) of Rievaux, who gives many evidently imaginary details. Some expressions in the 'Vita Eadwardi' seem to make it probable that Eadward, who must have been about forty at the time of his marriage, lived with his young and beautiful wife, though making her 'tori ejus consocia' (l. 1015), rather as a father than as a husband (ll. 1365, 1420, 1559). It is possible that he was physically unfit for married life (the whole question is exhaustively discussed by Dr. Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, ii. 47, 530–5). A leading feature in his character seems to have been a certain childishness, which comes out forcibly in the story that one day, when he was hunting—a pastime to which he was much addicted—a countryman threw down the fences which compelled the stags to run into the nets. The king fell into a rage, and cried, 'By God and his mother, I will do you a like ill turn if I can' (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 196). Again, it is said that he was once an unseen witness of a theft from his treasury. Twice the thief filled his bosom, and when he came to the chest for a third supply the king heard the footstep of his treasurer, and cried to the thief to make haste, for 'By the mother of God,' he said, 'if Hugolin [his Norman treasurer] comes, he will not leave you a coin.' The thief made off, and when the treasurer was aghast at the loss, the king told him that enough was left, and that he who had taken what was gone wanted it more than either of them, and should keep it (Ailred, col. 376).

During the first six or seven years of Eadward's reign, while he was evidently under the influence of Godwine, he showed some signs of activity. A Scandinavian invasion was threatened, for as soon as Magnus had taken possession of Denmark, he sent to Eadward demanding the throne of England in virtue of an agreement with Harthacnut (Laing, *Sea Kings*, ii. 397; *Corpus Poeticum Boreale*, ii. 178). A fleet was fitted out to meet the expected invasion, and the king appears to have taken a personal part in the preparations. Magnus, however, had to engage in a war with Swend, and, though he was victorious, died in 1047, before he could carry out his design on England. About this time a raid was made on the southern coasts by two Norwegian leaders, and Eadward embarked with his earls and pursued the pirates. The ships of the vikings took shelter in Flanders, and when, in 1049, the Emperor Henry called on Eadward to help him against his rebellious vassal Count Baldwin, the king gathered his fleet at Sandwich and lay there in readiness to take an active part against the common enemy. While he was there he was reconciled to Godwine's son Swegen, the seducer of the abbess of Leominster, who had left the kingdom, had been outlawed, and had betaken himself to a sea-rover's life, and he even promised to restore him all that he had forfeited. Swegen's brother Harold, and his cousin Beorn [q. v.], who had profited by his disgrace, persuaded the king to change his mind, and to refuse his request. In revenge Swegen slew Beorn, and was again outlawed; the next year his outlawry was reversed [see under Aldred]. Meanwhile, the foreign party was rapidly gaining strength; it was headed by Robert, who had come over to England as abbot of Jumièges, and had, in 1044, been made bishop of London. He had been one of the king's friends during his residence in Normandy, and soon gained such unbounded influence over him that it is said that if he declared 'a black crow to be white the king would sooner believe his words than his own eyes' (*Ann. Winton.* p. 21); he used this influence to set Eadward against Godwine. Another Norman, named Ulf, one of Eadward's clerks or chaplains, received the vast bishopric of Dorchester from the king in 1049. He was scandalously unfit for such preferment, and 'did nought bishop-like therein' (*Anglo-Saxon Chron.*) One effect of Eadward's foreign training, and of the promotion of foreign ecclesiastics, was an increase of the relations between our church and Latin Christendom. In 1049 Eadward sent representatives to the council held by Leo IX at Rheims, that they might bring him word what was done there

(*ib.*), and the next year he sent ambassadors to Rome for another purpose. Before he came to the throne he had, it is said, made a vow of pilgrimage to Rome, and its non-fulfilment troubled his conscience. Accordingly, we are told, though the details of the story are somewhat doubtful, that he consulted the 'witan' on the subject, and that they declared that he ought not to leave the kingdom, and advised him to apply to the pope for absolution. He certainly sent Ealdred [see under ALDRED] and another bishop to the council of Rome, and it is said that Leo there granted him absolution on condition that he gave to the poor the money that the journey would have cost him, and built or restored a monastery in honour of St. Peter (AILRED, col. 381; KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 824, doubtful; *Anglo-Saxon Chron.* sub an. 1047). He afterwards fulfilled the pope's command by building the West Minster. The same year Ulf attended another papal council at Vercelli, apparently seeking the confirmation of his appointment, which was a strange thing for an English bishop to do. The utter unfitness of the man whom Eadward had preferred was apparent to all, and 'they wellnigh broke his staff because he could not perform his ritual,' but he saved his bishopric by a large payment of money. The rivalry between Godwine and his adherents and the foreign party came to a trial of strength on the death of Archbishop Eadsige in October 1050. Ælfric [q. v.], a kinsman of Godwine, who was canonically elected to the archbishopric, and whose claims were upheld by the earl, was rejected by the king in favour of Robert of Jumièges, who received the see the following year. Eadward perhaps gratified himself by appointing Spearhafoc, abbot of Abingdon, a skilful goldsmith, to succeed Robert in the bishopric of London, for he was engaged to make a splendid crown for the king, a circumstance that suggests a corrupt motive for his preferment (*Historia de Abingdon*, i. 463). Eadward gave his abbey to a Norwegian bishop, who is said to have been his own kinsman, inducing the monks, though against their will, to receive him, by promising that at the next vacancy their right of election should be unfettered, a promise he did not keep (*ib.* p. 464). When Robert returned from Rome with his pall, Spearhafoc applied to him for consecration, presenting him with the king's sealed writ commanding him to perform the rite; this Robert refused to obey, declaring that the pope had forbidden him to do so, which makes it probable that the appointment was simoniacal. Eadward, however, gave Spearhafoc his 'full leave' to occupy the bishopric, unconsecrated as he was (*Anglo-Saxon Chron.* Peterborough, sub an. 1048). In the same year that Eadward made these ecclesiastical appointments (1051) he stopped the collection of the heregeld, a tax levied for the maintenance of the fleet, and disbanded the seamen. The remission of this tax was a highly popular measure, and was, according to legend, granted by the king in consequence of his seeing the devil sitting on the heap of treasure it had produced (HOVEDEN, i. 110). It should probably be connected with the decline of the influence exerted on Eadward by Earl Godwine, who could scarcely have approved of his thus doing away with the means of naval defence.

In the autumn of this year the men of Dover incurred the king's displeasure by resisting the outrages committed by one of his foreign visitors, Eustace, count of Boulogne, the second husband of his sister Godgifu. Eustace complained to Eadward, and he commanded Godwine, in whose earldom Dover lay, to march on the town and harry it. Godwine refused to obey this tyrannical order, and Archbishop Robert took occasion to excite the king against him, reminding him that the earl was, as he asserted, guilty of the cruel murder of his brother Ælfred (*Vita*, l. 406). A second cause of quarrel arose from the outrages committed by the garrison of a castle built by one of Eadward's French followers in Herefordshire, the earldom of Godwine's son Swegen. Eadward summoned a meeting of the 'witan,' and the Earls Leofric and Siward arrayed their forces on the king's side against those of Godwine and his sons. The king, who was at Gloucester, was for a while very fearful, but gained confidence when he found himself strongly supported, and refused Godwine's demands. Civil war was prevented by the mediation of Leofric; Swegen's outlawry was renewed; and Godwine and Harold were summoned to appear at the witenagemot at London. They demanded a safe-conduct and hostages, and when these were refused, the earl and his family fled the country and were outlawed. Archbishop Robert is said to have endeavoured to bring about a divorce between the king and queen, and, though he did not insist on this, he persuaded Eadward, who listened willingly enough to his counsel, to seize on the queen's possessions and send her off in disgrace to a nunnery. The foreign party had now undisputed influence over the king; Spearhafoc was deprived of the bishopric of London, and one of Eadward's Norman clerks named William was consecrated to the see. William, duke of the Normans, came over to England with a large number of followers to

visit his cousin, and Eadward received him honourably and sent him away with many rich gifts (*Anglo-Saxon Chron.* Worcester; Flor. Wig.; Wace, l. 10548 sq.) It is probable that during this visit Eadward promised to do what he could to promote the duke's succession to the English throne (*Norman Conquest*, ii. 294–306, iii. 677 sq.) In 1052 Godwine made an attempt to procure a reconciliation with the king, and his cause was urged by ambassadors from the French king and the count of Flanders, but his enemies prevented Eadward from attending to their representations. At last he determined to return by force. Harold plundered the coast of Somerset with some Irish ships, and Godwine, after making one ineffectual attempt to effect a landing with ships that he gathered in Flanders, joined his son, sailed up the Thames, anchored off Southwark, and was welcomed by most of the Londoners. Eadward did not hear of the earl's invasion until his fleet had reached Sandwich. On receiving the news he summoned his forces to meet him, hastened up to London with an army, and occupied the north side of the river. There he received a demand from the earl that he and his house should be restored. He refused for some while, and the earl's men were so enraged that they could with difficulty be withheld from violence. Stigand, since 1047 bishop of Winchester, mediated between the two parties, hostages were given, and it was determined to lay the whole question before an assembly which should be held the next day, 15 Sept. As soon as this arrangement came to their ears, all the foreigners, churchmen as well as laymen, fled in haste, Robert and Ulf escaping from England by ship. The assembly was held outside London, and there the earl knelt before the king, and adjured him by the cross he bore upon his crown to allow him to purge himself by oath of what was laid against him. The earl's cause was popular, he was declared innocent, he and his family were restored to all they had held before their outlawry, and Archbishop Robert and all the Normans who had acted unjustly and given evil counsel were declared outlaws. Eadward, who found himself deserted by his foreign favourites, and with far less power in the assembly than the earl, yielded to the entreaties of his advisers, and was formally reconciled to him and his sons. The reconciliation was speedily followed by the return and restoration of the queen. As far as matters of government were concerned Eadward was now wholly under the power of Godwine and his party, and their ascendency was shown by the appointment of Stigand to the archbishopric of Canterbury, which he held in defiance of the law of the church during the lifetime of Robert. On the death of Godwine, who was seized with a fit while feasting with the king in April 1053, Eadward appointed his eldest surviving son, Harold, to succeed him as earl of the West-Saxons, and from that time left the government in Harold's hands. At the same time he was not deprived of the society of his Norman favourites, for the sentence of outlawry proclaimed at the restoration of Godwine only touched those foreigners who had abused their power, and a large number of Normans remained in England during the remainder of the reign, and held offices in the court. With the exception, however, of the king's nephew, Ralph, who was allowed to retain his earldom, and William, bishop of London, who was personally popular, no great offices in church or state were after 1052 held by Normans (*Norman Conquest*, ii. 358).

Whatever the truth may be about Eadward's promise to Duke William with respect to the succession, he either of his own accord, or prompted by a decree of the 'witan,' sent for his nephew, Eadward the ætheling, in 1054, to come to him from Hungary, intending to make him his heir. The ætheling arrived in England in 1057. He was, however, kept—we are not told by whom—from seeing his uncle, and died shortly afterwards (*Anglo-Saxon Chron.*, Abingdon; Flor. Wig.) No other Englishman appears to have been so beloved by Eadward as Tostig, the brother of Harold. This stern and violent man gained great influence over the weak king, who in spite of his saintliness was spiteful and cruel when any one offended him, and must therefore have been glad to find a counsellor and companion as unscrupulous as he was himself when his passion was roused, and of a far stronger will than his own. Tostig was also dearer to the queen than any of her brothers, and Harold's scheme for increasing his own power by appointing him to rule over the earldom of Northumberland, at the death of Siward in 1055, was therefore acceptable at court. A further attempt to raise the power of the house of Godwine was the banishment of Ælfgar, earl of the East-Angles, who was accused of treason against the king and the people. Ælfgar, who according to most of our authorities was almost or altogether guiltless, was driven to rebellion, and in alliance with Gruffydd, of North Wales, made war on England, and did much mischief. Before long, however, Eadward reinstated him in all his possessions, and Gruffydd made submission to the English king and acknowledged his superiority. The wars of Harold in Wales, and his conquest of the country,

scarcely concern the king personally. On 3 May 1060 Eadward was present at the consecration of the collegiate church founded by Harold at Waltham. The Welsh war ended in 1063, and in August Harold presented the king with the head of Gruffydd, who had been slain by his own people, and with the beak of his ship. Eadward granted Wales to two of Gruffydd's kinsmen, and received their submission. He was hunting with Tostig in the forests near Wilton, in October 1065, when Harold brought him tidings of the insurrection of the north. The appointment of Tostig to the earldom of Northumberland had been disastrous. He seems to have passed most of his time with the king in the south of England; for he handed over the government of his vast earldom to a deputy. The Northumbrians, no doubt, were offended at finding their land reduced to the position of a 'mere dependency' (*Norman Conquest*, ii. 485). Tostig's violence and treachery enraged them; his absence encouraged them to revolt. The insurgents held an assembly at York, and chose an earl for themselves, Morkere, the younger son of Ælfgar, who during the last years of his life had been earl of Mercia, and had at his death been succeeded by his elder son Eadwine. Although the revolt of the north against Tostig lessened the power of Godwine's house, it does not follow that it was a check to the plans of Harold; for he had by this time formed an alliance with Eadwine and Morkere, and had married their sister. He now appeared before the king with the news that Tostig's followers had been slain, and that Morkere and the northern army had already advanced as far south as Northampton. Eadward at first seems to have believed that there was no cause for anxiety, and simply sent Harold to the insurgents with the command that they were to lay down their arms, and seek justice in a lawful assembly (*Vita*, l. 1159). They answered that they demanded the banishment of Tostig and the recognition of Morkere as their earl, and that on these conditions only they would return to their loyalty. After two other attempts to pacify them by negotiation the king seems to have awoke to the serious nature of the revolt. He left his hunting, and held an assembly at Britford, near Salisbury. There Tostig accused Harold before the king of stirring up this revolt against him, and Harold cleared himself of the charge by the process of law known as compurgation (*ib.* l. 1182). Eadward was eager to call out the national forces and put down the revolt with the sword. To this the nobles, evidently with Harold at their head, strongly objected, and when they were unable to dissuade him they withdrew from him and left him powerless. Harold met the insurgents at Oxford on 28 Oct., and yielded to all their demands. Three days later Eadward, unable to protect his favourite, loaded him with presents, and parted with him with exceeding sorrow, and Tostig and his family left England. Mortification and sorrow brought an illness on Eadward, from which he never recovered; and he called on God to avenge him on those who had failed him at his need and baffled his hopes of crushing the insurgents (*ib.* l. 1195 sq.)

Ever since 1051 Eadward had been carrying on the work of rebuilding the monastery of Thorney beyond the western gate of London in fulfilment of the charge laid upon him by the pope. The monastic buildings were completed in 1061, and during the last years of his life he pressed on the erection of the church, which he built a little to the west of the old one, so that the monks might be able to continue to perform service without interruption (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 824, 825, spurious; *Vita*, l. 974 sq.) A tenth of all his possessions was devoted to the work. His church was the earliest example in England of the Norman variety of romanesque architecture, and remained in the twelfth century as the model which others strove to imitate (*Gesta Regum*, ii. c. 228). It was consecrated on Innocents' day, 28 Dec. 1065. Eadward was too ill to be present at the magnificent ceremony, and his place was taken by his queen. He was now lying on his deathbed in his palace hard by, and when he heard that all had been duly accomplished he rapidly grew worse, and on 3 Jan. was so weak that he could no longer speak intelligibly (*Vita*, l. 1447). On the 5th he recovered his power of speech, and talked with those who stood round his bed: his queen, who was warming his feet in her bosom, Archbishop Stigand, Harold, his Norman staller Robert, and some few of his personal friends. He prophesied that a time of evil was coming on the land, and signified by an allegory how long that time would last. All heard him with awe save Stigand, who whispered in Harold's ear that age and sickness had robbed him of his wits. He took leave of his queen, commended her to the care of the earl, her brother, and it is said named him as his successor (*ib.* l. 1563; *Anglo-Saxon Chron.* Peterborough and Abingdon; Flor. Wig. i. 224). Then he bade him be gracious to those foreigners who had left their own land to come and dwell as his subjects, and who had served him faithfully, and gave directions for his burial. He received the last sacrament

and then died. He was buried the next day in his newly consecrated church of St. Peter at Westminster, probably by Abbot Eadwine (*Norman Conquest*, iii. 28; here, as elsewhere, Dr. Freeman uses that important record, the Bayeux tapestry, to good effect). The so-called laws of Eadward are said to have been drawn up from declarations made on oath by twelve men of each shire in 1070 (HOVEDEN, ii. 218); the earliest extant version of them was perhaps compiled by Ranulf Glanvill (*ib.* pref. xlvii). Probably in 1070 the Conqueror declared that all should live under Eadward's law, together with such additions as he had made to it, and a like promise was made by Henry I in his charter of 1100 (*Select Charters*, 81, 98). These grants, which should be compared with Cnut's renewal of Eadgar's law [see under CANUTE], signified that the people should enjoy their national laws and customs, and that English and Normans should dwell together in peace and security. Eadward's tomb before the high altar soon became the scene of many miracles (*Vita*, l. 1609). As the last English king of the old royal line he was naturally remembered with feelings of affection, that found expression in acts of devotion and legends of his holiness. Among these legends his vision that the seven sleepers of Ephesus had turned on to their left sides is one of the most famous (*Estorie*, l. 3341 sq.) Another of greater historical importance, as proving that he practised the custom of episcopal investiture, must be reserved for the life of Wulfstan, bishop of Worcester (AILRED, col. 406). He is said to have healed many persons, and especially those suffering from ulcers, by touching them. William of Malmesbury declares that those who knew him while he lived in Normandy said that he performed some miracles of this kind before he came to the throne, and that it was therefore a mistake to assert, as some people then did, that he had this power, not because of his holiness, but in virtue of his hereditary royalty (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 222). By the end of the twelfth century it appears to have generally been believed that the kings of England had the gift of healing in virtue of their anointing (PETER OF BLOIS, Ep. 150), and down to the early part of the eighteenth century the power of curing the 'king's evil' was held to descend as an 'hereditary miracle' upon all the rightful successors of the Confessor (COLLIER, *Ecclesiastical History*, i. 530). It was, of course, no part of the Norman policy to check the popular reverence for a king who was the kinsman of the Conqueror, and whose lawful successor William claimed to be, and as the monks of Westminster declared that the body of their patron had not undergone decay, his tomb was opened in 1102 by Gilbert Crispin, the abbot, and Gundulf, bishop of Rochester, who, it is said, found that the report was true (AILRED, col. 408). In 1140 an attempt was made by Eadward's biographer, Osbert, or Osbern, of Clare, prior of Westminster, to procure his canonisation by Innocent II. Osbert's scheme came to nothing, and Eadward was canonised by Alexander III in 1161, his day, of course, being that of his death (*Monasticon*, i. 308; *Norman Conquest*, iii. 33). The body of the new saint was first translated by Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, in the presence of Henry II, on 13 Oct. 1163, and the event is still commemorated on that day in the calendar of the English church (PARIS, ii. 221). At the coronation of Henry III, in 1236, the Confessor's sword was carried before the king by the Earl of Chester (*ib.* iii. 337). This sword, which was called 'custein,' or 'curtana,' formed part of the regalia, and the present 'sword of state' is the counterpart of it (LOFTIE, *Tower of London*, p. 19). Henry held the Confessor, to whom indeed he bore a certain moral resemblance, in special reverence, and caused his eldest son, Edward I, to be named after him (TRIVET, p. 225). Moreover, to do him honour, he rebuilt the abbey of Westminster, and on 13 Oct. 1269 performed with great splendour the second translation of the relics, which were laid in a shrine of extraordinary magnificence (WIKES, p. 226). The shrine was spoiled in the reign of Henry VIII, but the body of the king was not disturbed. Queen Mary restored the shrine, and the body of the Confessor was for the third time translated, on 20 March 1556–7 (*Grey Friars Chronicle*, p. 94, and MACHYN, *Diary*, p. 120, Camd. Soc.)

[Dr. Freeman has devoted vol. ii. of his Norman Conquest almost wholly to the reign of the Confessor, and it has not been possible to add anything material to what he has recorded. In the above article several events of the reign have been left out because they do not seem to have concerned the king personally; they will be found in Dr. Freeman's work. Lives of Edward the Confessor, ed. Luard (Rolls Ser.), contains, with some less important pieces, the Vita Æduuardi Regis, written for Queen Eadgyth, and La Estorie de Seint Aedward le Rei, a poem dedicated to Eleanor, queen of Henry III. This poem is largely based on the Vita S. Edwardi of Ailred [Æthelred] of Rievaux, Twysden, written early in the reign of Henry II. This again is taken almost bodily from the Vita by Osbert the prior, mentioned above. Osbert's work, which has never been printed, is in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 161 (Luard's Lives, pref. xxv; Hardy's Cat. of MSS. i. 637). See also Anglo-Saxon Chron.

(Rolls Ser.); Florence of Worcester (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Symeon of Durham (Rolls Ser.); William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Henry of Huntingdon, Mon. Hist. Brit.; Kemble's Codex Dipl. iv. (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Historia Ramesiensis (Rolls Ser.); Liber Eliensis (Stewart); Chron. de Abingdon (Rolls Ser.); Roger of Howden (Rolls Ser.); Brompton, Knighton, Twysden; William of Poitiers (Giles); Wace's Roman de Rou (Taylor); William of Jumièges (Duchesne); Saxo, Historia Danica (Stephanius); Encomium Emmæ [Cnutonis Gesta] (Pertz); Matthew Paris (Rolls Ser.); Wikes's Ann. Monast. iv. (Rolls Ser.); Dugdale's Monasticon; Green's Conquest of England; Dart's Westmonasterium; Stanley's Memorials of Westminster.] W. H.

EDWARD I (1239–1307), king, eldest son of Henry III and Eleanor of Provence, was born at Westminster, 17–18 June 1239. His birth was hailed with special joy, for it was feared that the queen was barren (Paris, iii. 518). There was much rejoicing in London, and many presents were made to the king, who insisted that they should be of great value, so that it was said, 'God gave us this infant, but our lord the king sells him to us.' Four days after his birth the child was baptised by the cardinal-legate, Otho, though he was not a priest, and was called Edward, after Edward the Confessor, whose memory was highly honoured by the king (Trivet, p. 225). Among his sponsors was Simon de Montfort, earl of Leicester. His name points to a newly awakened pride that was now felt by the English people in their nationality, and men were pleased to trace the descent of their king's son from Alfred (*Cont.* Flor. Wig.) An oath of fealty to the child was taken in every part of the kingdom (*Ann. Tewk.* p. 114). He was brought up at Windsor, under the care of Hugh Giffard (Paris, iv. 553). His mother took him with her to Beaulieu in June 1246 to the dedication of the conventual church, and while he was there he fell sick, so the queen stayed for three weeks in a Cistercian house against the rules of the order, that she might nurse him (*Ann. Wav.* 337). The next year the king sent an embassy to Henry, duke of Brabant, to propose a marriage between Edward and one of the duke's daughters (Mary ?), but the scheme was not successful. On 9 Aug. the lad was with his parents at Dunstable, and on 20 Sept. he lay very ill at London, and the king asked the prayers of all persons of religion in and around the city for his recovery (*Ann. Dunst.* p. 173; Paris, iv. 639). In 1252 Henry gave him Gascony, and in an assembly of Gascons in London declared him their new ruler, saving that he reserved the chief lordship. The Gascons, who received the announcement joyfully, did him homage, and Edward did homage to the king, and gave them rich gifts. A strong affection existed between Edward and his father, and when the king sailed for Gascony in August 1253, Edward, who came to Portsmouth to see him off, stood upon the shore and watched the vessel depart with many sobs. He was left under the guardianship of his mother and his uncle Richard, earl of Cornwall. In order to prevent the rebellious Gascons from obtaining help from Castile, Henry proposed a marriage between Edward and Eleanor, the sister of Alfonso X, and sent for his son, for Alfonso desired to see him. He gave him the earldom of Chester, and promised to give him Ireland and other possessions. Edward sailed from Portsmouth 29 May 1254, accompanied by his mother, and under the care of the queen's uncle, Boniface of Savoy [q. v.], archbishop of Canterbury, reached Bordeaux 12 June, and Burgos 5 Aug. He was married to Eleanor at the end of October in the monastery of Las Huelgas, received knighthood from King Alfonso, and then returned to Bordeaux. Henry gave the newly married pair Gascony, Ireland, Wales, Bristol, Stamford, and Grantham, so that he seemed nothing better than a mutilated king (Paris, v. 450), and entered into an agreement that if Edward's income from these sources did not amount to fifteen thousand marks he would make it up to that sum (*Fœdera*, i. 528). Edward remained in Gascony for about a year after his father had left it. His wife came to England 13 Oct. 1255, and he followed her on 29 Nov.; he was received by the Londoners with rejoicing, and conducted by them to the palace at Westminster (*Liber de Ant. Leg.* p. 23).

Soon after his return to England the Gascon wine merchants appealed to him to protect them against the extortions of the king's officers. He declared that he would not suffer them to be oppressed. The king was much grieved when he heard of his words, saying that the times of Henry II had come over again, for his son had turned against him. Many expected that a serious quarrel would take place. Henry, however, gave way, and ordered that the grievances of the merchants should be redressed. Nevertheless Edward deemed it advisable to increase his household, and now rode with two hundred horses (Paris, v. 538). On 4 June 1256 he was at a tournament at Blythe, which he attended in light armour, for he went there to be further instructed in the laws of chivalry (*ib.* p. 557), and in August he was with the king

at London, where great feasts were held in honour of the king and queen of the Scots. His devotion to the chivalrous exercises and pleasures that became his age and station led him to neglect the administration of the vast estates and jurisdictions placed under his control. He trusted too much to his officers, who were violent and exacting, and he was blamed for their evil doings. Nor was he by any means blameless even as regards his own acts. His followers were mostly foreigners, and he did not restrain them from acts of lawlessness and oppression. At Wallingford, for example, they made havoc of the goods of the priory, and illtreated the monks (*ib.* p. 593). And he set them a bad example, for Matthew Paris records as a specimen of his misdeeds how, apparently out of mere wanton cruelty, he horribly mutilated a young man whom he chanced to meet, an act which moved Englishmen greatly, and made them look forward with dread to the time when he should become king (*ib.* p. 598). With a father who was a Frenchman in tastes and habits, with a Provençal mother, and surrounded by foreign relations and followers, Edward in these his younger days is scarcely to be looked on as an Englishman, and his conduct is to be judged simply by the standard of what was held to become a young French noble. In one part of his possessions it was specially dangerous to excite discontent. Among the grants made him by his father in 1254 was the lordship of the Four Cantreds of Wales, the country that lay between the Conway and the Dee. Wales had long been a source of trouble to England, and her princes took advantage of every embarrassment that befell the English crown to add to its difficulties. As long as the country preserved its native laws and system of government it was impossible to reduce it to anything more than a state of nominal dependence, or to put an end to its power to do mischief. Moreover, as long as it remained virtually unconquered, the position of the lords marchers was almost that of petty sovereigns, and greatly weakened the authority of the crown. It is probable that Edward, young as he was, saw this, for he refused to recognise the native customs, and approved of an attempt made by one of his officers to enforce the introduction of English law. Unfortunately he did not see that this could only be carried out after a military conquest which the maladministration of Henry rendered impossible, and he chose as his lieutenant Geoffrey Langley, a greedy and violent man, who believed that he could treat the Welsh as a thoroughly conquered people, imposed a poll-tax of 15*d.* a head upon them, and tried to divide the land into counties and hundreds, or, in other words, to force the English system of administration upon them (*Ann. Tewk.* p. 158; *Liber de Ant. Leg.* p. 29). Llewelyn, the son of Gruffydd, took advantage of the discontent occasioned by these proceedings, and on 1 Nov. invaded the marches, and especially the lands of Edward's men. Edward borrowed four thousand marks of his uncle Richard to enable him to meet the Welsh, though as the winter was wet he was not able to do anything against them. The next year the Welsh invaded the marches with two large armies, and Edward applied to his father for help. 'What have I to do with it?' the king answered; 'I have given you the land,' and he told him to exert himself and strike terror into his enemies, for he was busy about other matters (Paris, v. 614). He made an expedition in company with his son, and stayed a while at Gannoch Castle, but no good was done. Edward, in spite of his large income, was pressed for money to carry on the war, and in 1258 pledged some of his estates to William de Valence, his uncle, a step which was held to promise badly for his future reign, for William was the richest of the host of foreigners who preyed on the country. He also endeavoured to alienate the Isle of Oléron to Guy of Lusignan, but this was forbidden by the king, and he was forced a few days later to revoke his deed (*Fœdera*, i. 663, 670). The Welsh made an alliance with the Scottish barons, and the war, which was shamefully mismanaged, assumed serious proportions, and added to the general discontent excited by the extravagance of the court and the general maladministration of the government.

This discontent was forcibly expressed in the demand made by the parliament which met at Westminster in April, that the work of reform should be committed to twenty-four barons, and on the 30th Edward joined his father in swearing to submit to their decisions (*Ann. Tewk.* p. 164). A scheme of reform, which virtually put the government of the kingdom into the hands of a baronial council, was drawn up by the parliament of Oxford. Edward upheld his uncles in their refusal to surrender their castles; he appears to have been constrained to accompany the barons to Winchester, where his uncles were besieged in the castle, and did not swear to observe the provisions of Oxford until after they and the other aliens who held it had been forced to surrender. Four counsellors were appointed for him who were to carry out a reform of his household (*Ann. Burt.* p. 445). Some disagreement arose between Edward and his father at Winchester, and a reconciliation

was effected in the chapter-house of St. Swithun's (*Ann. Winton.* p. 97). During 1259 a reaction took place; men found that the provisional government did not bring them all they hoped for, and a split arose in the baronial party between Simon, earl of Leicester, who was believed to be in favour of popular reforms, and the Earl of Gloucester, the head of the oligarchical section. Edward appears to have acted with Earl Simon at this period, for on 13 Oct., while the parliament was sitting at Westminster, a petition was presented to him by the 'community of the bachelorhood of England,' that is by the knights, or the class of landholders immediately below the baronage, pointing out that the barons had done nothing of all they had promised, and had merely worked 'for their own good and the hurt of the king.' Edward replied that, though he had taken the oath unwillingly, he would abide by it, and that he was ready to die for the commonalty and the common weal, and he warned the barons that if they did not fulfil their oaths he would take part against them (*Ann. Burt.* p. 471). The result of this movement was the publication of the provisions of Westminster. One of these renews a clause in the provisions of Oxford, in virtue of which four knights were to be appointed in each shire to remedy any injustice committed by the sheriff (*ib.* p. 477; *Const. Hist.* ii. 81). Thus Edward skilfully used the lesser tenants in chief to check the baronage in their attempt to control the executive, and began a policy founded on the mutual jealousy of his opponents, which he was afterwards able to pursue with great effect. In return for the check he had received Gloucester appears to have persuaded Henry, who was in France early in 1260, that his son was plotting with Earl Simon to dethrone him. The king of the Romans (Richard of Cornwall) held a meeting of barons in London, and a letter was sent to the king denying the rumour, and urging his return (Wikes, p. 124; *Ann. Dunst.* p. 214). He came back on 23 April, and shut himself up in London, refusing to see his son, who lodged in company with Simon between the city and Westminster (*Liber de Ant. Leg.* p. 45). At the same time his love for him was unabated. 'Do not let my son Edward appear before me,' he said, 'for if I see him I shall not be able to refrain myself from kissing him' (*Ann. Dunst.* p. 215). At the end of a fortnight they were reconciled, and the queen was generally held to have caused their disagreement. The foremost part that Edward was thus taking put him, we are told, to vast expense. He now went off to France to a great tournament, where he met with ill success (*ib.* p. 217). Although from this time he seems to have ceased to act in concert with Earl Simon, he kept up his quarrel with Gloucester until the earl's death in 1262. In that year he was again in France and Burgundy, in company with two of Leicester's sons, his cousins, was victorious in several tournaments, and badly beaten and wounded in one (*ib.* p. 219).

Early in February 1263 Edward, who was then in Paris, received a letter from his father urging him to return to England, for Llewelyn had taken advantage of the unsettled state of the country to renew his ravages. Edward hired a fine body of troops in France, and brought them over with him. Stopping only to put a garrison into Windsor, he advanced to Oxford, where the gates were shut against him. He then marched to Gloucester, and attacked the town, but though aided by a force from the castle was beaten off; he made his way into the castle by the river, using a ship belonging to the abbot of Tewkesbury. Some fighting took place, and on the approach of Earl Ferrers, Edward, finding himself overmatched, offered terms, and agreed to the barons' demands. On the retirement of their army he pillaged the town. (The order of events from this point almost down to the battle of Lewes is uncertain, and that adopted here must only be taken as an attempt to form a consecutive narrative.) Hoping to use Bristol as a basis of operations against the Welsh, and as a means of checking the new Earl of Gloucester, Gilbert of Clare, who was wholly on Leicester's side, he marched thither, and began to victual the castle. The townsmen came to blows with his foreign soldiers; he was forced to retreat into the castle, and was in some danger. Accordingly at the end of March he called Walter of Cantelupe [q. v.], bishop of Worcester, one of the baronial party, to help him, and the bishop undertook to bring him safely to London. On the way Edward, without giving him any warning, entered Windsor Castle on the plea of providing for the safety of his wife. He came up to London to the parliament held on 20 May. There Leicester and his party declared that he would be perjured if he did not abide by the provisions of Oxford, for they were indignant at his having brought a foreign force into the kingdom. He took up his quarters at the hospital at Clerkenwell, and, as he and his party were sorely in need of money, broke into the treasury of the Temple on 29 June, and took thence 1,000*l.* He made an attempt to relieve Windsor, which was threatened by Leicester, but the earl met him and, though he offered terms, detained him for a while by the advice of the Bishop of Worcester, who remembered the trick that had

been played upon him. Windsor surrendered on 26 July, and on 18 Aug. Edward agreed to terms that had been arranged by the king of the Romans. From 19 Sept. to 7 Oct. he was with his father at Boulogne. On the failure of the attempt at arbitration that was made there he returned to England, and at the parliament held on 14 Oct. he refused to agree to the barons' terms, complained that Earl Ferrers had seized three of his castles, and again took up his quarters at Windsor. He succeeded in winning over several barons to the royal side; he was now fully recognised as head of the party, and he made a strict alliance with the lords marchers (WIKES). In company with several of his new allies he joined the king in summoning the surrender of Dover Castle on 4 Dec. The castellan refused, and the royal forces retired. On the 16th he was party to the agreement to refer the question of the validity of the provisions to Lewis XI. Immediately after Christmas he set sail for France with his father. They had a stormy passage, and Edward made many vows for his safety. On 23 Jan. 1264 Lewis pronounced against the provisions.

The barons were dissatisfied with the result of the appeal, and Edward again made war in the marches; he joined his father at Oxford, and on 5 April, in company with the king and his uncle Richard, attacked Northampton. Simon de Montfort the younger, who defended the town, was taken prisoner, and would have been slain had not Edward forbidden it. After wasting the lands of Earl Ferrers and levelling his castle of Tutbury, Edward marched towards London, for some of the citizens offered to deliver the city to him. Leicester prevented this, and the king's army encamped in great force before Lewes. On 13 May Edward joined with the king of the Romans in sending a defiance to Leicester and Gloucester, who had now advanced with the baronial army to within a few miles of the town. In the battle of the next day, Wednesday, 14th, Edward occupied the right of the army, and early in the morning charged the Londoners, who, under the command of Hastings, were passing by the castle where he was quartered, in order to gain the town. They fled in confusion, and Edward, who was determined to take vengeance on them for the insults they had put on his mother the year before, pursued them, it is said, for four miles, and cut down a large number of them (RISHANGER, p. 32; WIKES, p. 151). As he returned from the pursuit he fell upon the enemy's baggage, and spent much time in taking it. When, as late, it is said, as 2 P.M. ('usque ad octavam horam,' *Chron. Mailros*, p. 195), he brought his men back to Lewes, he found that the battle was lost, that his father had taken refuge in the priory, and that his uncle was a prisoner. His men fled, and he and those who still followed him forced their way into the church of the Franciscans (*Ann. Wav.* p. 357). By the capitulation that followed, he and his cousin, Henry of Almaine, were made hostages for their fathers' conduct. They were taken to Dover and were put under the care of Henry de Montfort, who treated them as captives, and 'less honourably than was fitting' (WIKES, p. 153). Before long they were moved to Wallingford for greater safety. While Edward was there an unsuccessful attempt was made to rescue him (ROB. OF GLOUCESTER). He was afterwards lodged in Leicester's castle at Kenilworth, where he was during the following Christmas. While there he appears to have been treated honourably, for the countess was his aunt, and he was allowed to receive visitors, though he was closely watched. The subject of his release was debated in the parliament held in London in January 1265, and on 8 March terms were finally agreed upon which, while putting an end to his period of confinement, still left him helpless in Leicester's hands, and handed over to the earl the county of Chester and several of his most important possessions to be exchanged for other lands. A quarrel broke out between Leicester and Gilbert of Gloucester, and on 25 April Leicester made Edward march along with him to the town of Gloucester, for he thought it necessary to take some measures to check Earl Gilbert, who was now in alliance with the Mortimers and other marchers. Edward was next taken to Hereford. He kept up an understanding with the marchers through his chamberlain, Thomas of Clare, the earl's younger brother, and on 28 May effected his escape. He rode the horses of several of his attendants, one after another, as though to try their speed, and when he had tired them, mounted his own and rode away with Thomas, another knight, and four squires to the spot where Roger Mortimer was waiting for him, and was conducted in safety to Mortimer's castle at Wigmore. He entered into an alliance with Gloucester at Ludlow, swearing that if he was victorious he would cause 'the ancient, good, and approved laws to be obeyed,' that he would put away the evil customs that had of late obtained in the kingdom, and would persuade his father to remove aliens both from his realm and council, and not allow them to have the custody of castles or any part in the government. In other words, the direct control that had been exer-

cised over the king by the Earl of Leicester was to be done away with, the ancient powers of the crown were to be restored, and the king was on his side to govern England by Englishmen. Besides the marchers, several great nobles, Earl Warenne, William of Valence, Hugh Bigod, and others, now joined Edward, and his army was recruited from every quarter. Meanwhile, on 8 June, the bishops were ordered to excommunicate him and his adherents. Worcester was surrendered to him, he was master of the neighbouring towns and castles, and on 29 June he took Gloucester, after a stout resistance, allowing the garrison to depart with their arms and horses, and merely exacting a promise that they would not serve against him for a month. He broke down the bridges across the Severn and took away the boats, hemming Leicester in behind the line of the river, and cutting him off from his son, the younger Simon, who was raising troops in and about London. Hearing that the earl had sent to Bristol for transports to convey him from Newport to that town, he went on board three galleys belonging to the Earl of Gloucester, and in his company dispersed the Bristol ships, taking and sinking several of them, and then landed and drove Leicester's force across the Usk into Newport, where they saved themselves by breaking down the bridge (Wikes, p. 167; Rishanger, p. 43). Towards the end of July the younger Simon arrived at Kenilworth, and Leicester now hoped that he would be able to shut Edward and Gloucester in between his own force and that of his son (*Ann. Wav.* p. 364). Edward, who was stationed at Worcester, sent the young lord notice that 'he would visit him,' and being informed by spies (Wikes, p. 170; one of these spies, according to Hemingburgh, i. 322, was a woman named Margot, who dressed in man's clothes) that the troops at Kenilworth kept no strict watch, set out on the night of the 31st, and at dawn the next day surprised them in their quarters round the castle before they were out of their beds, and made so many prisoners that 'the larger half of the baronial army was annihilated' (Prothero, p. 356). On 3 Aug., hearing that the earl was making for Kenilworth, he left Worcester, and after advancing about three miles northwards, in order to deceive the enemy, turned to the east, crossed the Avon at Cleeve, and pressed on towards Evesham to intercept Leicester's army (*ib.* pp. 358–40). Mindful of the mistake he had made at Lewes, he now ordered his army with prudence (Wikes, p. 172), and detached a force under Gloucester to act in conjunction with that which he himself commanded, and with which early on the 4th he began the battle. His victory was complete, and the Earl of Leicester, his eldest son, Henry, and many nobles of their party were slain.

The sweeping sentence of forfeiture pronounced against the rebels drove them to further resistance. Edward, who received the goods of the rebel citizens of London, captured Dover Castle probably in October, and in November marched with a considerable force against the younger Simon, who with other disinherited lords had occupied the island of Axholme in Lincolnshire, and was ravaging the surrounding country. The position of the rebels was strong, and the attacking force had to make wooden bridges to enable them to reach the island, which was not surrendered until 28 Dec. Edward brought Simon to the council which his father was holding at Northampton, where he was sentenced to banishment. He then took him with him to London, and kept him at his court until he escaped, on 10 Feb. 1266, and went to Winchelsea, where the men of the Cinque ports who adhered to his family were expecting him. The king sent Edward to compel the submission of the ports. He defeated the Winchelsea men in a battle fought in their town on 7 March, and was persuaded to spare the life of their leader in the hope that he would persuade his fellow-rebels to return to their allegiance. This merciful policy was successful, and he received the submission of the ports on the 25th (*Ann. Wav.* p. 369; *Liber de Ant. Leg.* p. 82). In the middle of May he was engaged in an expedition against a disinherited knight named Adam Gurdon, one of the most mischievous of the many freebooters who infested the country. He came upon him in Whitsun week near Alton in Hampshire. Gurdon, who was a man of great strength, had his band with him, and Edward at the moment that he lighted on him was alone; for he was separated from his men by a ditch. Nevertheless, he at once engaged him single-handed, wounded him severely, and afterwards took him off to Windsor (Wikes, p. 189; Trivet's story, p. 269, that Edward, delighted with Gurdon's valour, caused him to be reinstated in his lands and made him one of his friends and followers, seems mere romance). In the July of this year Eleanor, who had returned to England the previous October, bore Edward his first-born son, named John. All this time the disinherited lords in Kenilworth were still holding the castle against the king; for hitherto the royal forces had been so much employed elsewhere that no great effort had been made to take it. At midsummer, however, Edward joined his father in laying

siege to the castle. It was defended with extraordinary courage. All efforts to take it proved vain, and the king and his son, who had already been learning a lesson of moderation from the difficulties they had had to encounter, offered terms embodied in the 'Ban of Kenilworth,' published on 31 Oct., which, though hard, were nevertheless a relaxation of the sentence of complete forfeiture. The castle was surrendered on 20 Dec. (WIKES, p. 195).

Many of the baronial party were dissatisfied with the Kenilworth articles, and early in 1267 Edward was called on to put down a rising in the north. John de Vescy, one of the rebel lords, had expelled the garrison from Alnwick Castle, which had once belonged to him, and had now been taken from him, had occupied it and his other old possessions, and had gathered round him a considerable number of northern magnates, each bound to help the rest to regain their lands. Edward at once gathered a large force, marched against him, and pressed him so hard that he made an unconditional submission. Edward pardoned him, and the rest of the allied barons gave up their undertaking. It seems likely that he paid the visit to his sister Margaret, the queen of Scotland, spoken of in the 'Chronicle of Lanercost' under 1266, when he was in the north in the early part of this year. He met the queen at Haddington, the object of his visit being to bid her farewell; for he was then contemplating a crusade. But it seems difficult to assign the date of the visit with any certainty. He joined his father at Cambridge, and marched with him to London; for the Earl of Gloucester, who since the publication of the Kenilworth articles had taken the side of the rebel lords, had occupied the city, and was besieging the legate Ottoboni in the Tower. After some weeks the earl made his peace with the king. Meanwhile a strong body of the disinherited were occupying the Isle of Ely, and had done much damage in the eastern counties. Henry had been attempting to blockade them when he was called off to London, and the legate had exhorted them to return to obedience to the church by accepting the Kenilworth articles. All attempts to compel or persuade them to surrender had been made in vain, and they had beaten off the ships that had been sent up the Ouse to attack them. Edward now marched from London against them. Their position seemed almost impregnable; for it was impossible to lead an army through the marshes without a thorough knowledge of the country, and it was easy to hold the few approaches to the island. He made his headquarters at Ramsey Abbey, and by promises and rewards prevailed on the people of the neighbourhood to come to his aid and to act as guides. Moreover, he managed to establish an understanding with Nicolas Segrave, who allowed his men 'to pass the outposts which he guarded' (PROTHERO). He also made causeways of wattles, and as it was a dry summer he was able to bring both horse and foot over them in safety, and to take up a position close to the island. Then he made a proclamation that he would either behead or hang any one who attacked any of his men or hindered him in any way; for he made no doubt of his success. This proclamation dismayed the defenders of the island. They submitted on 11 July, and were allowed the terms drawn up at Kenilworth (WIKES, pp. 207–10; *Liber de Ant. Leg.* p. 95; *Cont.* FLOR. WIG. pp. 199–201). Their surrender brought the struggle to a close. Never, probably, has so long and desperate a resistance to royal authority as that made by the disinherited been put down with the like moderation. And while the self-restraint of the victors must be attributed to some extent to the masterly policy pursued by the Earl of Gloucester in occupying London, it was also largely due to the wisdom and magnanimity of Edward. By the age of twenty-eight he had not only long outgrown the thoughtlessness of his early youth, but he had taken the chief part in breaking up the powerful combination that had usurped the executive functions of the crown, had saved the royal authority alike by his prudence and his valour, and had succeeded in putting an end to an obstinate rebellion by refraining from acts that would have driven the vanquished to desperation, and by readily admitting them to the terms that had been established by law, no less than by the skill and energy which he displayed as a military leader.

Later in the same year Edward visited Winchester, and went thence to the Isle of Wight, received its submission, and put it in charge of his own officers (*Ann. Winton.* p. 106). During the autumn, in conjunction with his brother and his cousin, Henry of Almaine, he arranged and engaged in a large number of tournaments, so that though these sports had been forbidden by royal decree (by Henry II, see WILLIAM OF NEWBURGH, v. c. 4) and by papal edict, there had not been so many held in England as there were that autumn for ten years and more (WIKES, p. 212). At the parliament held at Northampton on 24 June 1268 Edward, in pursuance of a vow he and his father had made, received the cross, together with his brothers and many nobles, from the hands of the legate Ottoboni. In the November parliament he was made

steward of England. He had already been appointed warden of the city and Tower of London in the spring, and in the autumn of this year he received the custody of all the royal castles (*Ann. Winton.* p. 107; *Liber de Ant. Leg.* p. 108). He held a grant from the king of the customs on all exports and imports, which he let to certain Italians for six thousand marks a year. These Italians levied the customs from the citizens of London, contrary to the privileges of the city. A petition was therefore presented to Edward by the Londoners complaining of these exactions, and in April 1269 he promised that they should cease, and received two hundred marks from the citizens as an acknowledgment. He further gained popularity by strenuously urging a statute, published in the Easter parliament, held at London, that the Jews should be forbidden to acquire the lands of christians by means of pledges, and that they should deliver up the deeds that they then held. The late war had greatly impoverished the landholding classes, and their Jewish creditors were pressing them severely. The measure was a wise one, because it helped to restore prosperity, and so strengthened the probability of a continuance of peace; and as the property of the Jews belonged to the king, it was a concession made to some extent at the expense of the crown (Wikes, p. 221). During this year Edward was busy in preparing for his crusade, and a large part of the subsidy of a twentieth lately imposed was voted to him for this purpose by the magnates and bishops. Some uneasiness was caused by the conduct of the Earl of Gloucester, who refused to attend parliament, alleging that Edward was plotting to seize his person. He is said to have looked with suspicion on the intimacy between Edward and his countess, from whom he was afterwards divorced (Oxenedes, p. 236). Gloucester's grievances were referred to the arbitration of the king of the Romans, and the earl then appears to have come up to the parliament, and to have opposed some proposals that were made as to the expenses of the crusade, probably with reference to the appropriation of the twentieth (Wikes, p. 208; *Ann. Winton.* p. 108). Meanwhile Edward was invited by Lewis IX of France to attend his parliament, in order to make arrangements for the crusade, which they purposed to make together. He went to Gravesend on 9 Aug., and the next day had a long interview with the king of the Romans, who had just landed, on the subject of the crusade. He then went to Dover, where he embarked (*Liber de Ant. Leg.* p. 110). When Lewis urged him to go with him he replied that England was wasted with war, and that he had but a small revenue. Lewis, it is said, offered him thirty-two thousand livres if he would consent (*Opus Chron.* p. 26). An agreement was made that the king should lend him seventy thousand livres, to be secured on Edward's continental possessions, twenty-five thousand of that sum being appropriated to the Viscount of Bearn for his expenses in accompanying him, and that Edward should follow and obey the king during the 'pilgrimage' as one of the barons of his realm, and send one of his sons to Paris as a hostage (*Liber de Ant. Leg.* pp. 111–14). He accordingly sent his son Henry to Lewis, who courteously sent him back at once (*Cont.* Flor. Wig. p. 204; *Flores*, ii. 348). He landed at Dover on his return on 8 Sept., and was present at the magnificent ceremony of the translation of King Edward the Confessor at Westminster on 13 Oct. In July 1270, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York and other lords, and at the head of an armed force, he arrested John, earl Warenne, for the murder of Alan la Zouche. On 5 Aug. he went to Winchester, obtained the king's license to depart and took leave of him, and then came into the chapter-house of St. Swithun's and humbly asked the prayers of the convent. He set out thence, intending to embark at Portsmouth; but hearing that the monks of Christ Church had refused to elect his friend and chaplain, Robert Burnell, to the archbishopric, he hastened to Canterbury in the hope that his presence would induce them to give way, but was unsuccessful in his attempt. He then went to Dover, where he embarked on 11 Aug., and sailed to Gascony, whither he had sent his wife on before him. His two sons he left in charge of his uncle, King Richard. Passing through Gascony and some of the mountainous districts of Spain, he arrived at Aigues-Mortes at Michaelmas, and found that Lewis had already sailed for Tunis.

When Edward landed on the African coast he found that Lewis was dead, and that his son Philip and the other chiefs of the crusade had made peace with the unbelievers. He was indignant at their conduct, and refused to be a party to it. 'By the blood of God,' he said, 'though all my fellow-soldiers and countrymen desert me, I will enter Acre with Fowin, the groom of my palfrey, and I will keep my word and my oath to the death' (*Opus Chron.* p. 29). He and the whole force sailed from Africa on 21 Oct., and on the 28th anchored about a mile outside Trapani, the kings and other chiefs of the expedition being taken ashore in small boats. The next morning a violent storm arose, which did much damage to the fleet. Edward's ships, how-

ever, thirteen in number, were none of them injured, and their escape was put down to a miraculous interposition of Providence to reward him for refusing to agree to the proposal of the other kings, that he should, like them, desist from his undertaking (HEMINGBURGH, i. 331–83; WIKES, p. 329). He spent the winter in Sicily, and in the early spring of 1271 sailed for Syria, parting with his cousin Henry, whom he appointed seneschal of Gascony, and who was shortly afterwards slain at Viterbo by Simon and Guy de Montfort. After touching at Cyprus to take in provisions, he arrived at Acre, which was now closely besieged, in May. His army was small, consisting of not more than about one thousand men. He relieved the town, and about a month later made an expedition to Nazareth, which he took, slew all he found there, and routed a force which tried to cut him off as he returned. At midsummer he won another victory at Haifa, and advanced as far as Castle Pilgrim. These successes brought him considerable reinforcements. He sent to Cyprus for recruits, and a large body came over declaring, it is said, that they were bound to obey his orders, because his ancestors had ruled over them, and that they would ever be faithful to the kings of England (HEMINGBURGH). A third expedition was made 1–27 Aug. Still his troops were too few to enable him to gain any material success, and these expeditions were little better than raids. In 1272 he received several messages from the emir of Jaffa, proposing terms of peace: they were brought by the same messenger, one of the sect, it is said, of the Assassins, who thus became intimate with Edward's household. In the evening of 17 June, his birthday, Edward was sitting alone upon his bed bareheaded and in his tunic, for the weather was hot, when this messenger, who had now come to the camp for the fifth time, was admitted into his presence. The door of the room was shut, and the messenger, having delivered his master's letters, stood bending low as he answered the question that Edward asked him. Suddenly he put his hand in his belt, as though to produce other letters, pulled out a knife, which was believed to have been poisoned, and hit violently at Edward with it. Edward used his arm to shield his body from the blow, and received a deep wound in it; then, as the man tried to strike him again, he gave him a kick that felled him to the ground. He seized the man's hand, wrenched the knife from him with so much force that it wounded him in the forehead, plunged it into the assassin's body, and so slew him. When his attendants, who had withdrawn to some distance, came running in, on hearing the noise of the scuffle, they found the man dead, and Edward's minstrel seized a stool and dashed out his brains with it. Edward reproved him for striking the dead. The master of the Temple at once gave him some precious drugs to drink to counteract the effects of the poison, and the next day he made his will (*Royal Wills*, p. 18). After a few days the wound in his arm began to grow dark, and his surgeons became uneasy. 'What are you whispering about?' he asked; 'can I not be cured?' One of them, an Englishman, said that he could if he would undergo great suffering, and declared that he would stake his life on it. The king then said that he put himself in his hands, and the surgeon having caused the queen, who was crying loudly, to be removed from the room, the next morning cut away the whole of the darkened flesh, telling his lord that within fifteen days he would be able to mount his horse; and his word came true. The story that Eleanor sucked the poison from the wound seems to lack foundation [see under ELEANOR OF CASTILE]. When the sultan Bibars, who was suspected of being concerned in this attempt, heard of its miscarriage, he sent three ambassadors to declare that he had no hand in it. As they made repeated salaams to Edward, he said in English, 'You pay me worship, but you have no love for me.' The incident proves that in spite of his French taste and feelings, shown, for example, in his delight in tournaments, Edward constantly spoke English. He found that he could not achieve any material success in Palestine, his men were suffering from sickness, and he knew that his father's health was failing. Accordingly he made a truce for ten years with the sultan, and on 15 Aug. set sail for Sicily. He landed at Trapani after, it is said, a voyage of seven weeks. He was entertained by King Charles, and while he was in Sicily heard of the deaths of his father on 16 Nov., of his uncle Richard, and of his first-born son, John. On the day of Henry's funeral, 20 Nov., the Earl of Gloucester, in accordance with a promise he had made to the late king, and the barons and bishops of the realm, swore fealty to Edward as their king. The magnates of the kingdom recognised and declared his right to succeed his father, and thus for the first time the reign of a sovereign of England began from the death of his predecessor, though the doctrine that the 'king never dies' was not propounded until a later age (STUBBS, *Constitutional Hist.* ii. 103).

Edward was tall and well made, broad-chested, with the long and nervous arms of a swordsman, and with long thighs that gripped the saddle firmly. His forehead was ample,

and his face shapely, and he inherited from his father a peculiar droop of the left eyelid. In youth his hair was so light that it had only a shade of yellow, in manhood it was dark, and in age of snowy whiteness. Although his voice was indistinct, he spoke with fluency and persuasiveness. He excelled in all knightly exercises, and was much given to hunting, especially to stag-hunting, and hawking (TRIVET, p. 281 sq.; HEMINGBURGH, ii. 1). Brave, and indeed rash as regards his own safety, he was now an experienced leader; he was prudent in counsel, ready in devising, and prompt in carrying out whatever measures the exigencies of the moment seemed to demand. His word was always sacred to him, and he was ever faithful to the motto, 'Pactum serva,' that appears upon his tomb. At the same time he did not scruple when in difficulties to make subtle distinctions, and while keeping to the letter he certainly sometimes neglected the spirit of his promises. He was hasty, quick to take offence, and towards the end of his life hard and stern, though he was not wantonly cruel. No one probably ever learnt more from adversity. By his absence from England he enabled men to forget old feelings of bitterness against him; he returned when the country was prepared for the restoration of orderly administration, fully determined to supply its needs. And he did not simply restore, he reorganised. He was 'by instinct a lawgiver.' The age was strongly affected by the study of civil law, and he kept Francesco Accursi, the son of the famous legist of Bologna, in his service. He was skilful in arrangement, in definition, and in finding remedies and expedients in materials already at hand. His laws were for the most part founded on principles previously laid down, which he worked out and applied to the present wants of the nation. It was the same with all his constitutional and administrative reforms. He carried on the work that had been taken in hand by Henry II, developed its character, and organised its methods. Everywhere he freed the state from the action of feudal principles, and encouraged, and may almost be said to have created, national political life. He was the founder of our parliamentary system, yet in this as in most else his work was the completion of a process that had long been going forward. In his hands the assembly of the nation ceased to have a feudal character; the lords are no longer a loose gathering of the greater tenants in chief, but a definite body of hereditary peers summoned by writ, and the clergy and the commons appear by their representatives. Rights and duties were clearly laid down, and in all his reforms there is conspicuous an extraordinary power of adapting 'means to ends.' Yet great as the benefits are which he conferred on the nation, he loved power and struggled for it, generally unsuccessfully, for the means of self-government that he organised and placed in the hands of the nation were turned against him, and were more than once sufficient to thwart his will. These struggles led him to take advantage of quibbles that naturally suggested themselves to his legal mind. At the same time if he had not striven for power he would not have been a strong man, or done so great a work. (On Edward's legislative and constitutional work see BISHOP STUBBS'S *Constitutional History*, vol. ii. c. 14, 15; and *Early Plantagenets*, p. 202 sq.)

The kingdom was in good hands, and Edward did not hasten home. After all that had happened he probably judged wisely in prolonging his absence. From Sicily he passed through Apulia, and went to Rome to visit Gregory X, who before his elevation had been with him on the crusade. He was received by the pope at Orvieto on 14 Feb. 1273, obtained a grant of the tenths of the clergy for three years to reimburse him for his crusading expenses, which pressed heavily on him, and stirred up Gregory to proceed against Guy de Montfort for the murder of his cousin. As he passed through Tuscany and Lombardy he was received with much honour by the cities to which he came, and saluted with cries of 'Long live the Emperor Edward!' (*Flores*, ii. 353). He crossed Mont Cenis 7 June, and forced a robber knight of Burgundy, who owned no lord, to become a vassal of the Count of Savoy. On the 18th he came to S. Georges les Reneins, near Lyons, and about this time engaged in a mêlée with the Count of Chalons. He received the count's challenge in Italy, and sent for divers earls and barons from England to come to him, so that he was at the head of a thousand picked men. The count singled him out, and strove to drag him from his horse, but was himself unhorsed. Then the fighting became serious, and the Burgundians, though superior in numbers, were defeated. Something more than a mere chivalrous encounter was evidently intended from the first, and the affair was called the 'little battle of Chalons' (HEMINGBURGH, i. 337–40). Edward reached Paris on the 26th, and did homage to Philip III for the lands he held of him. On 8 Aug. he left Paris for Gascony, where Gaston of Bearn was in revolt, and stayed there nearly a year. During a good part of this time he was engaged in an unsuccessful war with Gaston,

losing both men and horses from want of food and other privations in the difficult country in which his enemy sheltered himself. Once he made Gaston prisoner, but he escaped again, and he finally referred the quarrel to his lord the king of France. Gaston was afterwards sent over to England by Philip, made submission, and was for about four years kept in honourable confinement. In July 1274 Edward met the Count of Flanders at Montreuil, and arranged a dispute which had put a stop to the exportation of English wool to Flanders (*Fœdera*, ii. 24–32). He landed at Dover 2 Aug., was entertained by Gilbert of Gloucester and John of Warenne in their castles of Tonbridge and Reigate (*Flores*, ii. 363), reached London on the 18th, and on the next day, Sunday, was crowned with Eleanor at Westminster by Archbishop Robert Kilwardby. At the coronation he received the homage of Alexander of Scotland, but Llewelyn of Wales neglected the summons to attend. As many irregularities had been occasioned by the civil war, Edward on 11 Oct. appointed commissioners, with Burnell, bishop of Bath and Wells, whom he made his chancellor, at their head, to inquire into the state of the royal demesne, the rights of the crown, and the conduct of the lords of private franchises. The result of their inquiries is presented in the Hundred Rolls (pref. to *Rot. Hundred.* i.) At the beginning of November he proceeded to Shrewsbury, where he had summoned Llewelyn to meet him, but the prince did not attend (*Fœdera*, ii. 41). In a great parliament, held at Westminster on 22 April 1275, the king 'by his council,' and by the assent of his lords and 'of all the commonalty of the land,' promulgated the 'Statute of Westminster the First,' a body of fifty-one chapters or laws, many of which were founded on the Great Charter (*Statutes at Large*, i. 74; *Select Charters*, p. 438). In return he received a grant of the customs on wool, woolfels, and leather, now for the first time made the subject of constitutional legislation, and in the parliament of 18 Nov. demanded a fifteenth from the laity, and asked for a subsidy from the clergy as a matter of grace, for they were already charged with the papal grant of a tenth. He further forbade the Jews to practise usury, and commanded that they should live by merchandise. On 17 April he and the queen went on pilgrimage to Bury St. Edmunds in pursuance of a vow made in Palestine. During the summer he suffered much from the effects of the wounds he had received from the assassin at Acre, and these probably had caused a serious abscess with which he was troubled in the November previous. He was received at Oxford on 28 July with great pomp by the few clerks that were then there and by the citizens, but would not enter the city for fear of incurring the wrath of St. Frideswide (Wikes, p. 264). He went to Chester on 8 Sept. in order to meet Llewelyn, who refused to attend, was summoned to the forthcoming parliament, and again made default (*Fœdera*, ii. 57; *Ann. Wigorn.* p. 468).

In the Easter parliament of 1276 Edward ordered that the charters should be observed, and fully pardoned the 'disinherited.' With this policy of pacification is to be connected his presence at the translation of Richard of Chichester on 16 June and his gifts at the shrine, for the bishop had been wronged by his father. He received a message from Llewelyn offering to ransom his affianced bride, Eleanor de Montfort, who had fallen into the king's hand. As, however, he refused to restore the lands he had taken, and to repair the castles he had destroyed, his offer was refused. During the autumn the Welsh were troublesome, and Edward was at Gloucester on 28 Sept. and Evesham on 1 Oct. to take measures against them. On 1 Nov. he sent a body of knights to keep order in the marches, and on the 12th it was agreed by common consent of the bishops, barons, and others 'that the king should make war on the Welsh with the force of the kingdom,' which was ordered to meet him the following midsummer (*Fœdera*, ii. 68). In the October parliament the statutes 'de Bigamis' and of 'Rageman' were passed (*Statutes*, i. 115; *Constitutional History*, ii. 110). The king conducted the Welsh war in person, and moved the exchequer and king's bench to Shrewsbury. About 24 June he proceeded to Chester, had the woods cut down between Chester and the Snowdon country, and built the castles of Flint and Rhuddlan. Although many Welsh submitted to him, Llewelyn believed his position to be impregnable. Edward marched from Chester 31 July; Anglesey was taken by the fleet of the Cinque ports, and on 11 Nov. Llewelyn made his submission at Rhuddlan; he ceded the Four Cantreds, received Anglesey back at a rent of one thousand marks, promised to pay fifty thousand marks for peace, and to do homage in England, gave hostages, and was allowed to retain the homages of Snowdonia for his life. The payments were remitted, and the hostages restored (*Fœdera*, ii. 88-92). His brother David, who had fought for Edward, was rewarded with lands and castles, was knighted, and received the daughter of the Earl of Derby in marriage. Llewelyn did homage and spent Christmas with the king at London; and the troubles with Wales, which had lasted more or less from Edward's

youth, appeared settled at last. Edward's Welsh castles belong to the class named after him 'Edwardian castles,' for, though he was not the inventor of the style of fortification that marks them, he used it largely. They are built on the concentric principle, having two or three lines of defence, with towers at the angles and on the walls, and so arranged that 'no part is left to its own defences' (*Mediæval Military Architecture*, i. 157). With this war in Wales must probably be connected the visit paid by Edward and his queen to Glastonbury on 13 April 1278. The tomb of Arthur was opened on the 19th, and the relics were translated, Edward carrying the bones of Arthur, and Eleanor the bones of Guinevere (Adam of Domerham, p. 588). The war had been expensive, and on 26 June Edward issued a writ compelling all who had a freehold estate of 20*l.* to take up knighthood or pay a fine, a measure that did much to blend the lesser tenants-in-chief with the main body of freeholders. A few days later the parliament at Gloucester assented to the Statute of Gloucester, founded on the report in the Hundred Rolls, to amend the working of territorial jurisdictions; and proceeding on this statute and the report, Edward in August issued writs of 'Quo warranto,' which called on the lords to show by what warrant they held their jurisdictions, a measure that occasioned some discontent among them (*Statutes*, i. 117; Hemingburgh, ii. 5). Llewelyn did not attend the Gloucester parliament, and Edward went to the marches on 1 Aug. and received his homage. On 29 Sept. he received the homage of Alexander of Scotland at Westminster (*Fœdera*, ii. 126; *Ann. Wav.* p. 370), and with him and the queen and many nobles attended the marriage of Llewelyn and Eleanor de Montfort at Worcester on 13 Oct. In November the king caused all the Jews throughout the kingdom to be arrested, and on 7 Dec. extended this order to the goldsmiths, on the charge of coining and clipping the coin. In April 1279 he had 267 Jews hanged in London, and gave notice of the forthcoming issue of round coins, appointing places where the old coins might be exchanged at a settled rate.

On the resignation of Archbishop Kilwardby in 1278, Edward procured the election of his friend and minister, Robert Burnell, and sent envoys to Rome to beg the pope to confirm the election. His request was refused, and Nicolas III gave the see to John Peckham. The death of the queen's mother, to whom the county of Ponthieu belonged, obliged Edward and the queen to visit Paris on 11 May 1279. Edward did homage to Philip for Ponthieu, and definitely surrendered all claim to Normandy (*Ann. Wigorn.* p. 477; *Fœdera*, ii. 135). While at Amiens he met Peckham on his way to England, and received him graciously (Peckham, *Reg.* i. 5); he returned on 19 June. Peckham soon offended the king, for in his provincial council at Reading he ordered the clergy to post copies of the Great Charter on the doors of cathedral and collegiate churches, and to excommunicate all who obtained writs from the king to hinder ecclesiastical suits or neglected to carry out ecclesiastical sentences. Edward naturally took these decrees as an insult, and in the Michaelmas parliament forced Peckham to renounce them. He further replied to the archbishop's challenge by the statute 'De Religiosis' or of 'Mortmain,' passed on 15 Nov. by the parliament at Westminster, a measure which preserved the rights of the superior lords and of the crown, as lord-paramount, against the church, and which was a development of one of the provisions of 1259 (*Statutes*, i. 133; *Ann. Wav.* p. 392; Cotton, p. 158; *Select Charters*, p. 448; *Const. Hist.* ii. 112). And he also demanded a fifteenth from the spiritualities. In these measures Edward was not acting in a spirit of revenge, for the next year, when he remonstrated with Peckham for holding a visitation of the royal chapel, he accepted the archbishop's assertion of his right. Finding, however, that Peckham was about to issue canons in a council held at Lambeth in September 1281 that would have removed causes touching the right of patronage and other spiritual matters from the courts of the crown, he peremptorily interfered, and the archbishop was compelled to give way (Wikes, p. 285; Wilkins, ii. 50). On 9 June 1280 he attended a general chapter of the Dominicans held at Oxford. In the course of the last year he had issued a decree pronouncing that all Jews guilty of irreverence and all apostates to Judaism should be punished with death, and now, at the persuasion of the Dominicans, he ordered that the Jews should be forced to listen reverently to certain sermons that were to be preached for their edification. In September of this year he was at Lanercost, and held a great hunting in Inglewood Forest (*Chron. Lanercost*, p. 106).

While Edward was keeping Easter at Devizes in 1282, news was brought him that Llewelyn and David, whom he had loaded with favours, had rebelled against him, had taken his castles, slain a multitude of people, and carried off Roger Clifford, the constable of Hawarden, as a prisoner. At first he could not believe what he heard, but he soon found

that it was true (*Tywysogion*, p. 373; *Ann. Wav.* p. 398; WIKES, p. 288). He summoned the barons to meet him at Worcester at Whitsuntide, 6 April, and the bishops and knights to assemble at Rhuddlan on 2 Aug., and again moved the exchequer to Shrewsbury. Moreover he sent to Gascony for help from his subjects there. He made his headquarters at Rhuddlan, and ravaged Llewelyn's lands during August. Roads were made through the woods, the fleet of the Cinque ports again attacked Anglesey, and a bridge was begun across the straits. Edward's army met with some severe reverses, and on 6 Nov., when an attack was treacherously made by some nobles during the progress of negotiations, the Welsh routed the attacked force, and many were drowned in the Menai (*Ann. Osen.* p. 289). Encouraged by his success Llewelyn left Snowdonia, and was slain in a skirmish on 10 Dec. in Radnor; his head was brought to Edward, who had it sent to London and exposed on the Tower. He spent Christmas at Rhuddlan, and finished his bridge. The war taxed Edward's resources severely, and in March he caused to be seized the money that, in accordance with a decree of the council of Lyons, had been collected for a crusade and stored in the cathedral churches. This provoked an indignant letter from Martin IV. Before its arrival, however, the king had promised that the money should be refunded, and Peckham went off to meet him at Acton Burnell, and prevailed on him to make immediate restitution (*Registrum Peckham*, ii. 635 sq.) At Easter he was at Aberconway, where he built one of his famous castles. Wales was now thoroughly subdued, and the two most precious treasures of the Welsh, the crown of Arthur and a piece of the true cross, were brought to the conqueror. David was delivered up by the Welsh on 22 June, and taken to Edward at Rhuddlan, but the king would not see him. He determined 'that he should be tried before a full representation of the laity' (*Const. Hist.* ii. 116), and accordingly summoned a parliament to meet at Shrewsbury at Michaelmas, consisting of the baronage, two knights from each county, and representatives from certain cities and boroughs; the clerical estate was not represented, as the business concerned a capital offence. David was tried by a judicial commission before his peers, condemned, and sentenced to be drawn, hanged, beheaded, disembowelled, and quartered, a hitherto unheard-of sentence (*Ann. Osen.* p. 294). A few days later, at Acton Burnell, Edward put forth an ordinance, called the 'Statute of Acton Burnell,' which had been drawn up by him and his council for securing the debts of traders by rendering the profits of land liable for the same. He spent Christmas at Rhuddlan, on 9 Jan. 1284 was at York at the consecration of his clerk, Antony Bek, to the see of Durham, then held a parliament at Lincoln, and was again at Rhuddlan at mid-Lent, when he put forth the laws which are called the 'Statute of Wales,' though they were not the result of parliamentary deliberation (*Const. Hist.* ii. 117). By this statute the administration of the country was to some extent assimilated to the English pattern; in certain districts sheriffs, coroners, and bailiffs were appointed, though the jurisdiction of the marchers was still preserved in other parts, the English criminal law was to be in force, while in most civil matters the Welsh were allowed to retain their old customs. In the summer Edward celebrated his conquest by holding a 'round table' at Newyn in Carnarvonshire, near the sea; the festivities cost a large sum, and were attended by a crowd of knights, both from England and from abroad (*Ann. Wav.* p. 402; *Ann. Dunst.* p. 313). He spent Christmas at Bristol, where he held a 'singular, not a general, parliament,' consisting simply of certain specially summoned nobles (*Ann. Osen.* p. 300). Thence he went to London, where he was received with great rejoicing, for he had not been there for nearly three years (*Ann. Wav.* p. 402).

A summons from Philip III to render him such assistance in his war with Peter III of Aragon as was due by reason of his tenure of Gascony put Edward in some difficulty, for he was by no means anxious for the aggrandisement of France. However, he went to Dover as though to embark. While there the illness of his mother gave him an excuse for remaining at home, and he passed Lent in Norfolk and Suffolk (*Ann. Osen.* p. 300; TRIVET, p. 310). This year is marked by the 'culminating point in Edward's legislative activity' (*Const. Hist.* ii. 118). In the mid-summer parliament, held at Westminster, he published the collection of laws known as the 'Statute of Westminster the Second' (*Statutes*, i. 163), the first chapter of which, called 'De Donis Conditionalibus,' the foundation of estates tail, restricting the alienation of lands, probably shows the influence of the nobles. Other chapters deal with amendments of the law relating to dower, advowsons, and other matters. The whole forms a code, the importance of which did not escape the notice of contemporary chroniclers (*Ann. Osen.* p. 304; *Statutes*, i. 164). It was probably during this parliament, which lasted for the unusually long period of seven weeks, that Edward dealt decisively with the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction that had been in

dispute ever since the reign of Henry II, and his action in this matter should be compared with the policy of that king as expressed in the Constitutions of Clarendon. Undaunted by previous defeats Peckham evidently instigated the bishops of his province to present a petition to the crown against the summary conclusion of ecclesiastical suits by royal prohibition. Edward, however, limited the sphere of clerical jurisdiction to matrimonial and testamentary cases, and afterwards relaxed this by issuing the writ 'Circumspecte agatis,' which clearly defines the cases which were to be entertained by ecclesiastical courts (*Statutes*, i. 242; *Ann. Dunst.* p. 317; COTTON, p. 166; *Const. Hist.* ii. 119). In the Statute of Winchester, published in the October parliament, the king revived and developed the ancient laws relating to police organisation, and to the obligation of keeping arms for the public service, and applied them to the needs of the time by converting them into a complete system for the protection of persons and property, for the capture of offenders, and for the establishment of the liability of districts for losses sustained through the failure of their police arrangements (*Select Charters*, p. 459).

In a parliament consisting of ecclesiastical and civil magnates, held on 23 April 1286, Edward announced his intention of going to France. His presence was required in Gascony, though the immediate cause of his departure was to act as mediator in the long quarrel between the French and the Aragonese for the possession of Sicily. Edward had now for some years been looked on as the most fitting arbitrator in this matter. When, in 1282, Charles of Anjou and Peter of Aragon agreed to decide their dispute by a combat, in which each was to be supported by one hundred knights, they fixed the place of meeting at Bordeaux, and selected Edward as judge. On 5 April 1283 Martin IV wrote, forbidding him to allow the encounter, and Edward sent ambassadors with letters to Charles and Peter, declaring that 'if he could gain Aragon and Sicily' by it he would not allow it (*Fœdera*, ii. 226, 240, 241). Finally, while refusing to have anything to do with the matter, he ordered the seneschal of Bordeaux to put the city at the disposal of the Angevin prince. He mediated unsuccessfully in 1284 between Philip III and Peter, and the king of Aragon hoped to engage him on his side. Edward, however, while anxious to prevent the increase of the power of France at the expense of Aragon, which would have endangered his possession of Gascony, would not be drawn into war beyond the sea. The captivity of Charles the Lame and the deaths of Peter and Philip III opened the way for fresh negotiations, and Philip IV, the sons of Charles, and the nobles of Provence all invoked the interference of the king of England (*ib.* ii. 317, 318). Edward sailed on 23 May, leaving the kingdom in charge of his cousin Edmund, and taking with him the chancellor and many nobles (*Ann. Osen.* p. 306). He was honourably received by Philip, did homage to him at Amiens, and then went with him to Paris. After obtaining the settlement of several questions connected with his foreign possessions and rights, he left Paris at Whitsuntide and proceeded to Bordeaux, where he repressed some disaffection among the citizens with considerable sharpness (HEMINGBURGH, ii. 16). He then held a congress at Bordeaux, which was attended by representatives of the kings of Aragon, France, Castile and Majorca, and two legates, and on 25 July arranged a truce between France and Aragon (*Fœdera*, ii. 330). Finding, however, that it was impossible to make terms which would be acceptable both to Honorius IV and to James of Sicily, he persuaded Alfonso of Aragon to treat apart from his brother James, and on 15 July 1287 met Alfonso at Oléron, and made a treaty for the liberation of Charles and for a future peace. At the same time the project of a marriage between Alfonso and Edward's daughter Eleanor, which had for some years been hindered by papal interference, exercised on behalf of the Angevin interest, was confirmed by the kings. When Edward re-entered Gascony he suffered from a short though severe illness at Blanquefort, and on his recovery returned to Bordeaux, where he again took the cross, was appointed by the legate the captain of the christian army (*Ann. Wav.* p. 404), and expelled the Jews from Gascony and his other continental dominions. The treaty of Oléron was pronounced unsatisfactory by Nicolas IV (*Fœdera*, ii. 358), and in 1288 Edward agreed to a treaty at Campofranco, which secured the liberation of Charles on the payment of twenty thousand marks, of which ten thousand were lent him by Edward, along with his bond for seven thousand more, on the delivery of English hostages and on other conditions (*ib.* p. 368 sq.) The war, however, was renewed, and in 1289 Edward sent Odo Grandison with a sharp reproof to Nicolas for encouraging warfare among christian kings when the infidels were triumphing over the cause of the cross in Syria (AMARI). Meanwhile in a parliament held on 2 Feb. the lords refused a grant, and the Earl of Gloucester, speaking for the rest, declared that they would grant no more money 'until they saw the king's face in England again' (WIKES, p. 316).

It was evidently high time that Edward returned, and he landed at Dover on 12 Aug.

On his return he received many bitter complaints of the ill-doings of the judges in his absence, and on 13 Oct. appointed a commission to inquire into their conduct. Weyland, one of the chief justices, fled to the Franciscan priory at Bury St. Edmunds, and assumed the monastic dress. Edward ordered that he should be starved into submission, and allowed him to escape trial by going into perpetual banishment. All the judges save two were found guilty of various misdemeanors, were fined, and dismissed from office (*Ann. Dunst.* p. 355 sq.) Before the end of the year Edward visited his mother, who had during his absence taken the veil at Amesbury, and also made visits of devotion to the shrines of St. Thomas the Martyr, St. Edmund, and many other saints. He was a man of strong religious feelings: in times of difficulty he made vows, and on his return from any long journey or after any deliverance from danger he never failed to offer thanks publicly in one or more of the great churches of the kingdom. He appears to have usually passed Lent in more or less retirement in some of the great monasteries, and he certainly took pleasure in attending religious ceremonies, such as the consecration of bishops. At the same time his love of truth and his manliness of character kept him from giving countenance to superstition or imposture. On one of his visits to his mother at Amesbury, he found her in a state of high excitement over a man who pretended that he had been cured of blindness at the tomb of her late husband, King Henry. Edward knew that the man was lying, and told his mother so, which angered her so much that she bade him leave her room. King as he was, he obeyed her without a word, and as he went out met the provincial of the Dominicans, a man of much theological learning and one of his intimate friends. 'I know enough of my father's justice,' he said to him, 'to be sure that he would rather have torn out the eyes of this rascal when they were sound than have given sight to such a scoundrel' (Trivet). He spent Christmas at Westminster, held a parliament there early the next year, and on 23 April married his daughter Joan to his old enemy, Gilbert, earl of Gloucester. This marriage suggested to him a means of raising money, of which he was in constant need, though the heavy fines he had laid on the judges had lately swelled his treasury (*Ann. Osen.* p. 321). In a parliament held on 29 May, which consisted only of bishops and lay lords, he obtained leave to levy an aid *pur fille marier* of 40*s.* on the knight's fee. This tax fell only on the tenants in chief who were held to be represented by the magnates (*Select Charters*, p. 466). A second parliament was held in July, to which the king summoned two knights from each shire. A week before the day on which the knights were to come to Westminster, and while the parliament therefore consisted only of the magnates of the kingdom, Edward, at the request of the lords, published the statute 'Quia emptores,' forbidding subinfeudation; land alienated by a tenant, either in chivalry or socage, was to be held by feoffee not of the alienor but of the capital lord, and by the same services as it had been held by the feoffor. This act, while protecting the rights of the lords, strengthened the position of the crown towards its tenants. Its remoter consequences have been a vast increase in the alienation of lands and in the number of landholders, the termination of the power of creating new manors, and an advance in the gradual obliteration of all distinctions of tenure (*ib.* p. 468). In the same month the king and his privy council ordered that all Jews should be banished from the kingdom. In making this decree Edward was influenced by 'economical as well as religious' motives (*Const. Hist.* ii. 123); it was highly popular, and in return he received grants from the clergy and laity (Hemingburgh, ii. 22). Earlier in the month he celebrated the marriage of his daughter Margaret to John of Brabant with great magnificence. While he was holding his autumn parliament at Clipstone in Sherwood Forest, the queen lay sick at Hardeby, or Harby, in Nottinghamshire (*English Historical Review*, 1888, x. 315). He remained in the immediate neighbourhood until 20 Nov., and then went to her, and was present at her death on the 28th (*Archæologia*, xxix. 169). He felt her death very deeply, and is said to have mourned for her all the rest of his life (*Opus Chron.* p. 50). The funeral procession was stately, and the king accompanied it all the way; the funeral itself took place at Westminster on 17 Dec. [For further particulars see under Eleanor of Castile.] Edward spent Christmas at Ashridge in Buckinghamshire, where his cousin Edmund, earl of Cornwall, had founded a house of Bons Hommes, and remained there five weeks until 26 Jan. 1291, evidently to some extent in retirement. Early in May he proceeded to Norham to settle the dispute between the competitors for the throne of Scotland.

On the death of Alexander III of Scotland, in 1286, his granddaughter Margaret, the Maid of Norway, who was also great-niece to Edward, was left heir to the crown, and certain Scottish lords sent messengers to the English king on 29 March, to consult him on the

affairs of the kingdom (Stevenson, *Documents*, i. 4). During 1288 Edward was in treaty with Eric of Norway to procure a marriage between his son Edward and Eric's daughter Margaret, and the following year a bull was obtained from Rome sanctioning the marriage, which was approved of and settled by a meeting of commissioners of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Norway, held at Salisbury on 6 Nov. The treaty of Salisbury gratified the Scots, and a letter expressing their pleasure was sent to Edward by the estates assembled at Brigham, near Roxburgh, on 10 March 1290. The estates also entered into a treaty in July concerning the preservation of the rights and laws of the kingdom. Edward then appointed Antony Bek, bishop of Durham, governor of Scotland, in the name of Margaret and of his son Edward, that he might act with the regents and magnates in administering the kingdom according to its ancient laws; and further demanded that the castles should be put at his disposal, for he had heard of certain dangers that threatened the country. This demand, however, was refused, and was not insisted on. Margaret set sail from Norway and died before reaching Orkney (Stevenson). There were thirteen competitors for the crown, and the kingdom was in imminent danger of disturbance. Even before the death of Margaret, when the report of her illness had reached Scotland, the bishop of St. Andrews, the chief of the guardians of the kingdom, wrote to Edward urging his interference, and entreating him, should the queen be dead, to come to the border in order to prevent bloodshed, and to enable the faithful men of the realm to 'choose for their king him who ought to be so' (*Fœdera*, ii. 1090). Edward is said to have told his lords that he hoped to bring the king and kingdom of Scotland as much under his authority as he had brought Wales (*Ann. Wav.* p. 409). This reads like an afterthought. At all events he did nothing which tended to reduce Scotland to the same condition as Wales, for he took steps towards providing her with a king by summoning the lords of the kingdom to meet him at Norham on 10 May 1291, while certain of his own military tenants were also ordered to be there at the beginning of June. On opening the proceedings the chief justice demanded whether the Scottish barons would recognise Edward as their superior lord, and various passages were read from ancient chronicles showing how the Scottish kings had in time past done homage to the kings of England. When the barons were evidently unwilling to assent to this demand the king swore 'by St. Edward that he would either have the due right of his kingdom and of the crown of St. Edward of which he was the guardian, or would die in that place in the prosecution of it' (Hemingburgh, ii. 34). He gave them three weeks to consider their answer. When they came before him again on 2 June, the lords and clergy acknowledged his superiority, and each one of the eight competitors that were present afterwards did so singly for himself, promising to abide by his decision as that of the 'sovreign lord of the land' (*Fœdera*, ii. 529). Edward received seisin of the land and castles, and immediately restored the guardianship of the land to the regents, adding a lord to their number and appointing a chancellor and chamberlain. He received oaths of fealty from several lords, his peace was proclaimed, he appointed a commission consisting partly of Englishmen and partly of Scotchmen, chosen by Bruce and Baliol to decide on the claims of the competitors, adjourned the court until 2 Aug., and then proceeded to Edinburgh, Stirling, and Perth, receiving the homage of the people at each place to which he came. The court was again opened at Berwick on 2 Aug., the proceedings were adjourned, and the king returned to the south. The proofs of the recognition of his superiority over Scotland were by his command entered in the chronicles of divers English monasteries. In the March of this year Nicolas IV granted him a tenth of ecclesiastical revenue for six years for the crusade he was contemplating (*ib.* ii. 509). Acre had fallen, and the christians of the East were looking to Edward to defend their cause. He was never able to undertake this crusade, and he applied the money which is said to have been collected with much strictness to other purposes (Cotton, p. 198). On 8 Sept. he buried his mother with considerable state at Amesbury. A private war that had been carried on between the Earls of Gloucester and Hereford took him to Abergavenny to hold an inquisition concerning a castle that Gloucester had built there without license. Thence he went to Hereford, and on 9 Nov. to Worcester. On the 25th he solemnly kept the anniversary of the queen's funeral at London, with a large number of bishops who came thither for the purpose (*Ann. Wigorn.* p. 506). After keeping St. Edmund's day, 28 April 1292, with his son and daughters at Bury St. Edmund's, and visiting Walsingham Abbey (*Cont.* Flor. Wig. ii. 264), Edward again proceeded to Berwick. While he was at York he caused Rhys, son of Meredydd, who had risen against him and had been defeated and captured, to be tried and executed for treason. On 2 June the court was again opened at Berwick. The hearing of the case lasted until 17 Nov. [for

particulars see BALIOL, JOHN, 1249–1315], when Edward delivered his judgment, declaring that John Baliol ought to have seisin of the kingdom, saving the right of the king of England and his heirs. On the 20th Baliol swore fealty to Edward at Norham, and on 26 Dec., after his coronation, he did homage to him at Newcastle (*Fœdera*, ii. 593).

A petty war between the seamen of the Cinque ports and of Normandy, which began in 1293, gradually assumed serious proportions, and our seamen beat the French fleet in a pitched battle in the Channel. Some hostilities took place between the French and the Gascons, and Philip IV, who was bent on gaining Gascony, summoned Edward to appear before him in his parliament (*ib.* ii. 617). Edward made every effort to avoid war. A marriage was proposed between him and Blanche, a sister of the French king, with whom Edward was, it is said, greatly in love (*Ann. Wigorn.* p. 515), and he consented to give Philip seisin of Gascony, which was to be restored to him as Blanche's dower. Philip dealt dishonestly; he hoped to persuade Edward to come over to France with the intention, it is said, of entrapping him at Amiens (COTTON, p. 233); he broke off the negotiation for the marriage in 1294, and, having got Gascony into his possession, refused to deliver it up again, and declared that the promise was forfeited by Edward's non-attendance. War was now inevitable. The king seized all the merchants' wool, and with their consent levied an impost on it; he obtained a promise of liberal help from the lords 'in a court or parliament' held on 5 June, summoned his military tenants to assemble at Portsmouth on 1 Sept., and organised his fleet, dividing it into three large squadrons (*Const. Hist.* ii. 125, 126; NICHOLAS, *Hist. of the Navy*, i. 270). On 4 July he seized all the coined money in the cathedrals, monasteries, and hospitals (*Cont.* FLOR. WIG. ii. 271). He did not himself go to Gascony, for his presence was required in Wales, where Llewelyn's son Madoc, in North Wales, and other chiefs in Cardiganshire and Glamorganshire, were in insurrection. The proposed expedition came to nothing, though a force under Sir John St. John and other leaders made a short campaign. He sent an embassy to Adolf of Nassau, the king of the Romans, and bought an alliance with him. The Count of Bar he had already secured, for he had given him his daughter Eleanor to wife the previous Michaelmas at Bristol; he took several princes of the Low Countries into his pay, and sent to ask Spanish help. On 21 Sept. he met the clergy of both provinces at Westminster, and, having explained his necessities and apologised for his violent measures, demanded their help. They asked for a day's grace, which was accorded them. They offered two tenths for a year. Edward sent a messenger to them, who told them that the king would have half their revenues, and that if they refused he would put them out of his peace, adding: 'Whoever of ye will say him nay, let him rise and stand up that his person may be known.' The dean of St. Paul's tried to pacify the king, and fell dead with fright in his presence. The clergy had no head, for the archbishopric of Canterbury had fallen vacant in 1292, and Robert Winchelsey, who had been consecrated a few days before this, had not returned from Rome; they offered to obey the king's will if he would withdraw the statute of mortmain. This he refused to do, and they were forced to promise the half demanded of them (HEMINGBURGH, ii. 54; *Cont.* FLOR. WIG. ii. 274; *Ann. Wigorn.* p. 517; *Flores*, p. 394). In October the laity made grants for the Welsh war in a parliament in which the cities and towns were not represented, and their contribution was collected from them 'by separate negotiation conducted by the king's officers' (*Const. Hist.* ii. 127). Edward marched to Worcester and thence to Chester towards the end of November. He ravaged parts of Wales, but was shut up in Aberconway by Madoc, and reduced to some straits. During this war he built the castle of Beaumaris; he spent Christmas at Aberconway, and was detained by the war until May 1295. Two legates, who were sent over to endeavour to make peace, awaited his arrival at London on 1 Aug. A great council was held and the legates were authorised to conclude a truce with Philip, but Edward refused to make peace because his ally Adolf was not willing to do so. The treacherous designs of a certain knight named Turberville, who promised Philip that he would obtain the custody of the Cinque ports and deliver them to him on the appearance of a French fleet, were foiled by the refusal of Edward to grant him the command he desired. Nevertheless, an attack was made on Hythe, part of Dover was burnt by the French, and it was evidently thought that the king ran some risk in attending the enthronement of Archbishop Winchelsey at Canterbury on 2 Oct. (*Cont.* FLOR. WIG. ii. 278; *Ann. Dunst.* p. 400). The king stood in great need of supplies; the repeated descents of the French were intolerable, and no progress was made with the war; the campaign in Wales had been protracted; more serious trouble seemed likely to arise with Scotland; and the council held in August had not dealt with the subject of

money, for it was from its composition incapable of taxing the nation. This was to be done by a parliament which the king summoned to meet in November. Writs were addressed to both the archbishops and to the several bishops containing a clause (*Præmunientes*) commanding the attendance of the clergy of each diocese by their representatives, to the baronage, and to the sheriffs ordering each of them to return two knights elected to serve for his shire, and two citizens or burgesses elected for each city or borough within it. Thus, this parliament of 1295 was an assembly in which the three estates of the realm were perfectly represented, and from that time every assembly to which the name of parliament can properly be applied was constituted on the same model, though the desire of the spiritual estate to tax itself separately in its own assembly, and its neglect to appear in the council of the nation by its proctors, have in fact changed the composition of parliament (*Const. Hist.* ii. c. xv.; *Select Charters*, p. 472 sq.) Edward received grants from each estate separately, but was not able to prosecute the war with France in person, for his presence and all the money he could get were needed for an expedition against the Scots.

From the time that Baliol received the kingdom Edward had abstained from all direct interference with the affairs of Scotland. In consequence, however, of the acknowledgment of the feudal superiority of the English king he had a right, and was bound as lord paramount, to entertain and adjudicate upon appeals made to his court, and, in spite of Baliol's remonstrances, he had asserted and maintained this right in the case of an appeal made by a burgess of Berwick, which lay within the Scottish border, a few months after the settlement of the crown, and Baliol had implicitly allowed the validity of his assertion. Before long an appeal was lodged against Baliol by Macduff, earl of Fife. After some delay he appeared at a parliament held at Westminster in May 1294, and there seems to have promised an aid for the French war (Hemingburgh, ii. 45). The Scottish nobles were dissatisfied with his conduct, and, anxious to take advantage of the embarrassment of England, opened negotiations with Philip of France. When Edward heard of this he demanded that the border fortresses of Scotland should be placed in his hands until his war with France was concluded. This was refused, and in March 1296 an army led by seven Scottish earls ravaged Cumberland, and made an unsuccessful attack on Carlisle (*Chron. Lanercost*). Edward was not taken unprepared, for he had already summoned Baliol and the Scottish lords to meet him at Newcastle on 1 March to answer for certain injuries done to his subjects, and had gone thither with a large army. He was joined by the Bishop of Durham with the forces of the north, and on the 28th the English army of five thousand horse and thirty thousand foot entered Scotland, Edward crossing the Tweed near Coldstream, and the bishop near Norham. Berwick was summoned to surrender; Edward's terms were refused; and on the 30th he prepared to assault it. The English ships which were to act with the army attacked too soon, and three of them were burnt by the enemy. Edward led the assault in person, the town was quickly taken, and, as was the custom of war, very many Scots, more it is said than eight thousand, were put to the sword; the garrison of the castle surrendered on terms; and the women of Berwick were also after some days sent off to their own people (Hemingburgh, ii. 99; Knighton, col. 2480, puts the number of the slain at 17,400; and Fordun, xi. 54, 55, dwells on the barbarities of the English). While Edward remained at Berwick making new fortifications, a messenger from Baliol brought him the Scottish king's answer to his summons, the renunciation of his fealty and homage. 'Ha! the false fool,' Edward is said to have exclaimed, 'what folly his is! If he will not come to us, we will come to him' (Fordun). He detached part of his army to attack the castle of Dunbar, arrived there himself on 28 April, the day after Surrey had defeated the Scots, and received the surrender of the place. During May Haddington, Roxburgh, Jedburgh, and other towns were surrendered to him. He was now joined by some Welsh troops, and about this time sent back part of his English army. On 6 June he appeared before Edinburgh; the garrison began to treat on the fifth day, and the castle surrendered on the eighth day of the siege. At Stirling, where the only man left of the garrison was the porter to open the gates of the castle, he was joined by a large body of Irish troops. He kept the festival of St. John the Baptist (24 June) with much state at Perth, creating several knights, and while he was there received messengers from Baliol, who brought him the king's surrender. On 10 July he formally accepted Baliol's surrender of the kingdom at Montrose. He then marched northwards to Aberdeen, Banff, and Elgin, receiving everywhere the submission of the nobles and people, and returned to Berwick on 22 Aug., bringing with him the famous coronation stone from the abbey of Scone, and having achieved the conquest of Scot-

land in less than twenty-one weeks (Stevenson, *Documents*, ii. 37). On the 28th he held a parliament at Berwick, where he received the fealty of the clergy, barons, and gentry, the names filling the thirty-five skins of parchment known as Ragman Roll. All the lands of the clergy were restored, very few lords were dispossessed, the ancient jurisdictions were not interfered with, 'no wanton or unnecessary act of rigour was committed, no capricious changes were introduced' (Tytler), and the king, having appointed a guardian, treasurer, and other officers for Scotland, returned to England, and held a parliament at Bury St. Edmunds on 3 Nov.

At this parliament, while the laity made their grants, the clergy, after thoroughly discussing the matter, authorised Archbishop Winchelsey to inform the king that it was impossible for them to grant him anything (*Ann. Dunst.* p. 405; Cotton, p. 314). The cause of this refusal was that in the previous February Boniface VIII had issued the bull 'Clericis laicos,' forbidding on pain of excommunication the clergy to grant, or the secular power to take, any taxes from the revenues of churches or the goods of clerks. Edward would not accept this answer, and bade the clergy let him know their final decision on the following 14 Jan. Meanwhile he ordered the lay subsidy to be collected, and, after staying some time at St. Edmund's, went to Ipswich and kept Christmas there. While he was there he married his daughter Elizabeth to John, count of Holland, and then made a pilgrimage to Walsingham. On 14 Jan. 1297 he sent proctors to the clergy, who were met in council at St. Paul's to decide the question of the subsidy. After setting forth the dangers that were threatening the kingdom, these proctors declared that unless the clergy granted a sufficient sum for the defence of the country the king and the lords of the realm would treat their revenues as might seem good to them. The king, who was then at Castle Acre in Norfolk, received a deputation sent by the synod on the 20th, who declared that the clergy found themselves unable to make any grant. Edward merely answered the Bishop of Hereford, the spokesman of the deputation: 'As you are not bound by the homage and fealty you have done me for your baronies, I am not bound in any way to you.' He was exceedingly wroth, for he was in great need of money for the defence of the kingdom, and on the 30th he declared he would outlaw the whole body of the clergy, and take their lay fees into his own hand (*ib.* p. 318). The clergy of the province of York submitted, made a grant, and received letters of protection, and the writ was issued against the clergy of the southern province on 12 Feb. (*Ann. Wigorn.* p. 530). Two days before this the archbishop excommunicated all who should act contrary to the papal decree.

Meanwhile the king's army was defeated in Gascony, and Edward, who had on 7 Jan. made alliance with Guy, count of Flanders, determined to send a fresh force to Gascony, while he made an expedition in person to Flanders, in order to act against Philip in the north. With this view he held a parliament at Salisbury on 25 Feb., to which only the baronage of the kingdom was summoned, without the clergy or the commons. He asked the lords, one after another, to go to the war in Gascony. Every one of them refused, and he declared that those who would not go should give up their lands to those who would. Then he appealed to Humphrey Bohun, third earl of Hereford [q. v.], the constable, and Roger Bigod, fifth earl of Norfolk [q.v.], the marshal; both excused themselves, not, as they might have done, on the ground that the king 'had strained his rights every possible way' (*Const. Hist.* ii. 131–3, which should be consulted for a full account of the crisis of this year), but simply because they were only bound to serve with the king. They persisted in their refusal [for Bigod's well-known altercation with the king see Bigod, Roger]. The council broke up, and the two earls forthwith gathered a force, which was joined by several lords, and numbered fifteen hundred men. Edward was uneasy, though he kept his feelings to himself (Hemingburgh, ii. 121). He was obliged to carry out his plans and engagements, and as his lords refused to help him he seized the wool of all those who had more than five sacks, obliged the other merchants to redeem theirs by paying a heavy toll or 'maletote,' and ordered the sheriffs to furnish supplies of provisions from their several counties. The lords who held with the two earls would not allow the royal officers to take anything from their lands. Meanwhile Edward had an interview with the archbishop at Salisbury on 7 March, and pointed out that he was acting from necessity, and that it was useless to attempt to resist. At a synod held on the 26th the archbishop, while refusing himself to yield, allowed the clergy to follow their own consciences, and almost all of them purchased their peace of the king by the grant of a fifth (Cotton, p. 323). Edward then issued writs for a 'military levy of the whole kingdom' to meet at London, though constitutionally the national force could not be compelled to serve out of the kingdom (*Const. Hist.* ii. 135). When 7 July, the day appointed for the meeting of

the force, arrived, the constable and marshal sent to Edward, stating that they attended not in virtue of a summons, but at his special request; for so the message to the sheriffs was worded (*Fœdera*, ii. 767), and they begged to be excused from performing their duties in marshalling the host, and Edward, who was now at Portsmouth making preparations for his expedition, appointed others to execute their offices. They then proceeded to draw up a list of grievances (Hemingburgh, ii. 124). Edward evidently thought it well to take some measures to gain the goodwill of the nation; for he promised that all his military tenants who served in Flanders should receive pay, and he was reconciled to the archbishop. On the 14th he appeared before the people on a platform in front of Westminster Hall, in company with the archbishop, his son Edward, and the Earl of Warwick, and with many tears asked them to pardon him for what he had done amiss, saying that he knew that he had not reigned as well as he ought, but that whatever they had given him, or whatever had without his knowledge been taken from them by his officers, had been spent in their defence. 'And now,' he added, 'I am going to meet danger on your behalf, and I pray you, should I return, receive me as you do now, and I will give you back all that has been taken from you. And if I do not return, crown my son as your king.' Winchelsey wept, and promised that he would do so, and all the people held up their hands in token of their fidelity (*Flores*, p. 409).

The barons, however, represented that it was unadvisable that the king should depart; that a rebellion had broken out in Scotland, that the country was exhausted, that no more tallages ought to be levied, and that the Great Charter and the Forest Charter should be confirmed (*ib.*) Edward promised to confirm the charters if the clergy and laity would make him grants. The grants of the laity were promised by certain of those who had come up to the army levied from the various shires, and the king tried in vain to induce the earls to hold a conference with him. They sent envoys to him at St. Albans on the 28th, but declined to come in person. He ordered the subsidies to be collected from the laity, and on 7 Aug. published a letter which the sheriffs were bidden make known to the people at large. In this letter he said that he had heard that a list of grievances was drawn up; he had not refused to receive it, he had not as yet seen it; his people should remember that whatever money he had taken from them he had used in their defence. If he should return he would amend all things, if not he would have his heir do so; he was bound to go to the help of his ally, the Count of Flanders, and his going was necessary for the safety of the nation. The lords had promised him a grant on condition that he confirmed the charters, and he prayed the people to give him all the help they could, and bade them keep the peace (Cotton, pp. 330–4). After the publication of this letter the list of grievances was presented; it purports to be the work of the estates, and after objecting to the king's expedition sets forth the poverty of the realm, the extent to which it was burdened by taxation, the disregard of the Great Charter and of the Forest Charter, and the unjust seizure of wool, and finally declares that the king ought not to leave the kingdom in the face of the Scottish rebellion, and for other causes (Hemingburgh, ii. 361). Edward, who was then at Odemer, near Winchelsea, answered that he could make no reply to these matters without his council, and that some members of it had already crossed to Flanders, and others were in London, and he requested the earls that if they would not go with him, they would at least abstain from doing mischief in his absence. While he was at Winchelsea he met with an accident that might have proved fatal. As he was riding on the mound that defended the town on the seaward side, watching his fleet, his horse shied at a windmill, and refused to advance; he urged it with whip and spur, and the animal suddenly leaped from the mound on to the road which lay far below, winding up the steep ascent of the hill. Luckily it alighted on its legs; the road was muddy from recent rain, and though the horse slipped some feet, the king was able to bring it up again, and entered the gate of the town unhurt (Trivet, p. 359). On 10 Aug. the clergy who had been received into the king's protection met in convocation to decide the matter of the grant that had been demanded of them; they returned answer that they would apply to the pope for permission; and as the king was dissatisfied with this reply he ordered certain not immoderate taxes to be collected off them.

Edward set sail from Winchelsea on the 23rd, landed at Sluys, and proceeded to Bruges. There he offered to bear half the expense of fortifying the town, but found that the townsmen were hostile to the count; they refused to become parties to the alliance he had made with Guy, and were inclined to surrender the town to the French. It was not safe for him to remain there, and he marched to Ghent, where the burghers had made terms with the French. Edward's soldiers treated the Flemish with much violence, plundered the neighbourhood, and especially the town of

Damme, where they slew two hundred men, for which the king had some of them hanged (HEMINGBURGH, ii. 159; RISHANGER, p. 413). While he was in Flanders his son Edward was forced to confirm the charters, and to add certain clauses that met the grievances stated in the remonstrance drawn up by the earls. The charters thus confirmed and enlarged were sent over to Edward, who confirmed them at Ghent on 5 Nov. (*Statutes*, i. 273). The additional articles are directed against taxation without the common consent of the realm, and against the arbitrary imposition of the maletote of 40*s.* on wool, the right of the crown to the ancient aids, taxes, and prises being reserved. The special importance of this enactment lies in the fact that chiefly owing to the work of Edward the consent of the nation now meant the concurrence of the estates of the realm assembled in parliament, without which taxation was now generally illegal. When the Great Charter was granted, no such machinery for the expression of the popular will was in existence. The articles are extant in two forms: in French, the version which holds a permanent place in the statute book, and by which Edward considered that he was bound; and in Latin, under the title 'De Tallagio non concedendo,' and in this form they are considerably more stringent. Although the Latin version was not a statute, and is either an inaccurate version of the French articles, or may represent the demands on which they were founded, it has obtained the force of a statute because it is referred to as such in the preamble to the Petition of Right of 1628 (*Const. Hist.* ii. 141 sq.) Shortly after this an invasion of the Scots gave Winchelsey an opportunity for bringing the dispute between the crown and the clergy to an end by recommending a grant. Edward did not accomplish anything against the French; the Flemish towns were not inclined to support him, and his allies gave him no help. Still his presence in Flanders checked Philip, and inclined him to accept the mediation of Boniface VIII, who interfered in the cause of peace in August (*Fœdera*, ii. 791). After some delay terms were arranged for two years. While negotiations were in progress a serious commotion was raised in Ghent against the English on 3 Feb. 1298, and Edward's foot soldiers burnt and sacked part of the city. The Flemings excused their rising by declaring that the English had done them much injury, and Edward, who knew that he was in their power, was forced to give them a large sum as a recompense (HEMINGBURGH, ii. 170 sq.) On 14 March he returned to England. Later in the year the terms with France were renewed through the pope's mediation, and it was arranged that Edward should marry Margaret, the French king's sister, and that his heir Edward should be contracted to Isabella, Philip's daughter. Edward's marriage took place at Canterbury on 10 Sept. 1299. The truce of 1298 was renewed the next year, and finally was converted into a lasting peace, which was concluded on 20 May 1303. Gascony was restored to him, but he sacrificed the interests of his ally, the Count of Flanders, whom he left exposed to the vengeance of the French king. The French war ended opportunely for Edward, for the Scottish rebellion demanded his immediate attention. Wallace had inflicted a disastrous defeat upon the English at the bridge of Stirling on 11 Sept. 1297, and had laid waste Cumberland and Westmoreland.

Immediately on his return Edward ordered commissioners to make inquiry into grievances in every county, and summoned a lay parliament to meet at York on 25 May. The army was commanded to assemble at Roxburgh on 23 June, and the Earls of Norfolk and Hereford declared that they would not attend unless the king again confirmed the charters and the new articles. In order to meet their demand certain nobles swore, on behalf of the king, that if he was victorious he would do what they required. After visiting the shrine of St. John of Beverley and other holy places, Edward met his army at Roxburgh, and found himself at the head of seven thousand horse and eighty thousand foot nearly all Welsh and Irish, and was soon joined by a force from Gascony. He marched through Berwickshire without meeting the enemy, for the Scots kept out of his way and wasted the country. At Kirkliston he waited for news of the ships he had ordered to sail into the Forth with supplies. Provisions grew scarce, his Welsh infantry became mutinous, and he had determined to fall back on Edinburgh and there wait for his ships, when part of his fleet at last appeared with the supplies he needed, and on the third day afterwards, 21 July, a messenger from two Scottish lords informed him that the enemy was at Falkirk. His army camped that night in the open on Linlithgow heath, and the next morning, when the trumpet sounded at daybreak, the king's horse, excited by the general bustle, threw him as he was in the act of mounting, and broke two of his ribs with a kick (TRIVET, p. 372). Edward, nevertheless, mounted and rode throughout the day as though he had received no injury. The Scottish cavalry fled without striking a blow (FORDUN); the archers gave way after their leader was slain, but

the infantry, which Wallace had arranged in four compact masses, stood firm, and the English horse charged in vain against their spears. At last they were broken by the English archers and by volleys of stones from the other foot soldiers, and were then helpless. Edward's victory was complete; twenty thousand Scots are said to have perished, while only two men of rank fell on the English side (TRIVET). On advancing to Stirling, Edward found that the Scots had burnt the town; he lay there fifteen days to recover from his hurt, sending out expeditions to ravage the country, and putting the castle in a state of defence. He then marched to Abercorn, and thence through Clydesdale to Ayr, intending to advance into Galloway, but provisions failed, and he returned through Annandale and received the surrender of Bruce's castle of Lochmaben. On 9 Sept. he was at Carlisle, and there held a council, at which he granted the estates of the Scottish nobles to his own lords. The Earls of Norfolk and Hereford now requested that they might return home, declaring that their horses and men were worn out, though they let it be known that they were offended because the king had granted the Isle of Arran to Thomas Bisset, a Scottish lord who had seized it, whereas they said that he had promised to do nothing without their counsel. Edward's army, which had already suffered much from fatigue and privations, was greatly weakened by their departure, and no further operations of any importance were attempted. After staying for a while at Jedburgh, Newcastle, Durham, and Tynemouth, he spent Christmas at Cottenham, and marched southwards early in 1299, having utterly crushed the rising under Wallace, but leaving the land beyond the Forth virtually unsubdued, and the whole country ready to break into revolt. In spite of his magnificent army, his success was limited by want of provisions, and by the discontent and suspicion of the constable and marshal.

The promise Edward had made before his expedition that he would confirm the charters was claimed in a great council he held at London on 8 March. He was displeased, and, though he declared that he would give his answer the next day, removed from the city during the night. Suspecting that he meant to evade his promise, the lords came after him and blamed him for his removal. He declared that he had moved for the sake of better air, and told them to go to his council for his answer. The Great Charter was confirmed, but to the confirmation of the Forest Charter was added, 'saving the right of our crown,' and when the people, who were assembled in St. Paul's churchyard to hear the charters and the king's confirmation, heard this salvo, their blessings were turned into curses (HEMINGBURGH, ii. 183). Another council was held in May, and the king then confirmed both the charters without any salvo, and promised to issue a commission for a perambulation of the forests, in order to settle disputes and declare the reformation of abuses. At the request of the pope, Edward liberated Baliol in July and delivered him to the legate, for he was anxious to meet the wishes of Boniface, in the hope that he would speedily regain Gascony, and was disappointed at not receiving it at his marriage in September. Soon after his marriage he began to make arrangements for another expedition to Scotland, for the regents chosen by the Scottish lords, who were upheld by Philip, were threatening his garrison in Stirling. On 11 Nov. he held a council at York, and advanced thence with his army as far as Berwick. There, however, the barons declared that it was too late in the year to make a campaign, and that they would go no further, for the king, they said, was not carrying out the confirmation of the charters. He was therefore obliged to return, and to authorise the surrender of Stirling. After spending Christmas at Berwick, he returned to the south, and held a parliament at London on 6 March 1300, which 'contained both commons and clergy' (*Const. Hist.* ii. 149). The question of the charters was again renewed. Again the king confirmed them, and gave his consent to a series of articles supplementary to the Great Charter ('articuli super cartas'), enacting chiefly sundry reforms in the system of administering justice. In this parliament the king yielded to the will of the nation in the matter of the forests, and ordered the perambulations. At midsummer he again met a force composed of those who owed military service at Carlisle, and marched into Scotland with three thousand men at arms, his banner displaying 'three leopards courant of fine gold, set on red, fierce, haughty, and cruel' (*Siege of Carlaverock*, p. 23). He took Lochmaben, and, about 10 July, the castle of Carlaverock, which was for some time held against his army by a garrison of only sixty men. As a reward for their valour Edward granted them life and limb, and ordered that each of them should receive a new garment (*ib.* p. 87). He entered Galloway, and there had an interview with certain Scottish lords, who demanded that Baliol should be allowed to reign over them; he refused their demands and marched to Irvine, remaining in Galloway until the end of October. While he

was at Sweetheart Abbey Archbishop Winchelsey came to him on 27 Aug., in company with a papal envoy, bringing him a bull from Boniface commanding him to abstain from further hostilities, denying his right to the lordship of Scotland, and declaring that it belonged to the holy see. Winchelsey, it is said, added an exhortation of his own, and spoke of the safety of the citizens of Jerusalem, and how those who trusted in God were as Mount Zion (Ps. cxxv. 1). 'By God's blood,' the king shouted, 'I will not hold my peace for Zion, nor keep silence for Jerusalem' (Is. lxii. 1), 'but I will defend my right that is known to all the world with all my might' (Walsingham). The story may not be true, but so devout a king as Edward may well have capped texts with the archbishop to good purpose. A letter was given to Winchelsey promising that the king would send the pope an answer after he had consulted with the council of his lords, for it was 'the custom of the kingdom of England that in matters touching the state of the realm their advice should be asked who were affected by the business' (Matt. Westmon. p. 426). On 30 Oct. he yielded to Philip's mediation, and granted the Scots a truce until the following Whitsuntide.

In January 1301 Edward held a parliament at Lincoln, at which the report of the perambulations of the forests was received. The forest question was still productive of suspicion and annoyance; it touched the rights and property of the king, and it deeply affected the wellbeing of many of his subjects. Edward would not consent to the disafforestments which were contemplated unless the prelates and lords could assure him that he might do so without breaking his oath—probably some oath not to alienate the property of the crown, and without stripping the crown of its rights. On the other hand, the lords complained of Walter Langton, bishop of Lichfield, the treasurer, and presented a series of articles by Henry Keighley, one of the members for Lancashire, demanding a fresh confirmation of the charters, the execution of the disafforestments, and various other concessions, while the bishops declared that they must obtain the pope's consent before they could make a grant. The conduct of the barons appears to have been unreasonable. Edward scarcely deserved to be treated with so much distrust, though he had to some extent brought it on himself by the tenacity with which he had clung to what seemed to him to be the rights of the crown in the matter of the forests. He upheld his minister, but was forced to assent to most of the barons' articles. Nevertheless he was deeply angered, and imprisoned Keighley, though only for a short time. An article declaring that the goods of the clergy should not be taxed without the consent of the pope he rejected; it was a sign that Winchelsey was acting in conjunction with the barons. The archbishop had already shown by his conduct with regard to the papal pretensions over Scotland that he was not unwilling to use his office to embarrass the king, and Edward did not forget to requite him for the part he now took in forwarding his abasement (*Const. Hist.* ii. 150 sq.) Edward skilfully broke the alliance between the archbishop and the barons. After the commons had been dismissed, he laid the pope's bull before the barons, and requested them to send their own answer. On 12 Feb. they wrote a letter to the pope on behalf of the whole community of the realm, and addressed to him by seven earls and ninety-seven barons, declaring that the kings of England ought not to answer concerning their rights before any judge, ecclesiastical or civil, together with more of a like kind (*Fœdera*, ii. 860; Hemingburgh, ii. 211). In this letter the bishops had no part. On 7 May the king also sent the pope a long statement of the historical grounds on which he based his claim (*Fœdera*, ii. 863). His troubles with the baronage now ceased. His old opponent, Humphrey Bohun, was dead, and his son Humphrey, fourth earl of Hereford [q. v.], married the king's daughter Elizabeth in 1302, and surrendered his estates, receiving them back in tail, and the childless Earl of Norfolk made the king his heir, and entered into a similar arrangement (see under Bigod, Roger, fifth earl of Norfolk, and *Const. Hist.* ii. 154).

At midsummer Edward again entered Scotland and took the castle of Bonkill in the Merse. No vigorous opposition was made to his authority south of the Forth, though the Scots lost no opportunity of secretly injuring the English, and pursued the wise policy of cutting off stragglers, and distressing the army by wasting the country so that no forage was to be had. Many horses died of hunger and cold before Edward went into winter quarters at Linlithgow, where he spent Christmas. His designs of conquest were checked by Philip, who again prevailed on him to grant a truce until November 1302. Soon after his return to England the difficulties that had restrained his action against Scotland began to clear away. Boniface found that he needed help against Philip, and, as he hoped to obtain it from Edward, he gave up the cause of the Scots; and Philip, who was anxious to devote all his strength to the war with Flanders, concluded the treaty of Amiens, which

left the Scots to their fate. Edward, now that he had at last regained Gascony and was free from embarrassment at home and abroad, was able to carry on a more decided policy with respect to Scotland. Affairs had gone badly there, for on 24 Feb. 1303 Comyn had defeated an English army under Sir John Segrave at Roslin. On 26 May Edward met his army at Roxburgh; he marched by Edinburgh, Perth, Brechin, Aberdeen, and Banff without meeting any resistance save at Brechin, which stood a siege of about three weeks. Then he advanced into Moray, received the submission of the lords of the north at the castle of Lochindorb (FORDUN, p. 989), and continued his ravages as far as Caithness. Stirling, the only place that still held out against him, he passed by. He marched south to Dunfermline, where he was joined by his queen, and passed the winter there, receiving the fealty of many Scottish nobles, and among them of Comyn. His expenses were heavy, and he was forced to find out some way of raising money. Accordingly, in February 1304, he issued writs for collecting tallage from his demesne. This was contrary to the spirit, though not to the letter, of the confirmation of the charters; it was an expedient that naturally commended itself to his legal mind as a means of obtaining his purpose without violating the exact terms of his pledge. In March he held a parliament at St. Andrews, and all the Scots who were summoned attended it save Wallace and Fraser; of Wallace he wrote on the 3rd that no terms were to be offered him save unconditional surrender. At St. Andrews he fixed the amounts which the barons were to pay as the price of obtaining his peace. When this business was concluded he laid siege to Stirling Castle; it was defended with great courage, and Edward, who was eager to take it, was more than once hit by missiles from the walls. The siege taxed his resources; he sent to England for materials for Greek fire, ordered the Prince of Wales to strip off the lead from the churches of Perth and Dunblane and send it to him, and employed Robert Bruce in conveying the framework for his engines (*Documents*, ii. 479, 481). The garrison surrendered at discretion on 24 July. Edward granted them their lives and merely punished them by imprisonment. He then made arrangements for the government of the country and the custody of the castles, and, accompanied by a number of Scottish nobles, marched southwards to Jedburgh, re-entered England, and spent Christmas at Lincoln. The court of king's bench and the exchequer, which had been at York ever since June 1297, now returned to Westminster. The following summer Wallace was delivered up to the English, was brought to London, was tried for treason, murders, robberies, and other felonies, and was put to death on 23 Aug.

Edward returned to London on 30 Jan. 1305, and, finding that during his absence a number of crimes of violence had been committed by hired ruffians, he caused a statute to be made against such offences, and in April issued a writ founded upon it, called 'of Trailbaston,' for the arrest and punishment of the guilty (*Rolls of Parliament*, i. 178; *Fœdera*, ii. 11960). He had trouble in his own family, for in June the Prince of Wales, who was under the influence of Piers Gaveston, grievously insulted and wronged Bishop Langton, and was kept in disgrace for six months [see under EDWARD II]. In the course of the summer a Gascon noble, Bertrand de Goth, archbishop of Bordeaux, one of Edward's subjects, was raised to the papacy as Clement V. Political and personal reasons combined to render him anxious to oblige Edward, and he invited him to be present at his coronation (*Fœdera*, ii. 966). The king did not go, but sent ambassadors to treat of certain matters that 'lay deep in his heart' (*ib.* p. 971). These were the promises he had made concerning the charters, and the offence that Winchelsey had given him (*Chronicles, Edward I*, Introd. cv). He considered that he had been forced to diminish the just rights of the crown by yielding to the demands for a perambulation and disafforesting, and that his subjects had taken an unfair advantage of him; and it can scarcely be doubted that his love of hunting rendered the concessions he was forced to make peculiarly grievous to him. Accordingly, at his request, Clement absolved him from the pledges he had entered into in 1297 (*ib.* p. 978). In condemning his conduct, and it is certainly worthy of condemnation, it must be remembered that he took no advantage of this bull, and the religious and moral standard of the time should also be taken into account. Clement further ordered that no excommunication was to be pronounced against him without the sanction of the Roman see, and thus deprived Winchelsey of the means of defending himself against the king. Edward had already shown that he looked on the archbishop with disfavour, for he must have approved of the excommunication pronounced against Winchelsey in 1301 in the matter of a suit brought against him at Rome, and his anger was kept alive by a quarrel between Winchelsey and Bishop Langton. In 1306 the archbishop heard that the king and Langton had procured his suspension, and went to the king

and asked him to stand his friend. Edward replied with great bitterness, reminding him of the trouble and humiliation he had brought upon him, and telling him plainly that he wished him out of the kingdom (Birchington, p. 16). The letter of suspension that the king had sought for arrived (*Concilia*, ii. 284, 286), and Winchelsey left England, not to return during the king's life. His absence enabled the king and the parliament to give a check to the aggressions of Rome, and led to the famous letter of remonstrance against papal oppressions drawn up by the parliament at Carlisle in the spring of 1307. Nevertheless Edward was forced to make some concessions to the pope, and to draw back in a measure from the position he had taken up in order to secure his triumph over the archbishop (*Const. Hist.* ii. 156).

Meanwhile, in September 1305, Edward held a council at London, composed of certain bishops and nobles both of England and Scotland, who drew up a scheme for the administration of Scotland, dividing the country into judicial districts, and appointing justices and sheriffs as in England (*Flores*, p. 462). The scheme was approved by the king, and he fully believed that he had at last secured the submission of the country. In the following year, after taking his pleasure on the borders of Wiltshire and Hampshire, he went to Winchester to keep Lent, and while he was there received tidings of the rebellion of Robert Bruce and the murder of Comyn. He despatched a force to Scotland, under the Earl of Pembroke and two other lords, gave Gascony to his son Edward, and issued a proclamation that all who were bound to receive knighthood should come up to Westminster for that purpose. Then he journeyed to London in a horse-litter, for he was infirm and could not ride. On Whitsunday, 22 May, he held a magnificent festival, knighted his son, and invested him with the duchy of Aquitaine, and the prince knighted about three hundred of his companions in Westminster Abbey. Then, in the midst of the festival, the king vowed 'before God and the swans' that he would punish Bruce, and after that would no more bear arms against christian men, but would go to the Holy Land and die there (*ib.* p. 462; Trivet, p. 408). The prince at once marched to Scotland, and he followed by easy stages towards Carlisle, where he had summoned his army to assemble on 8 July. He was attacked by dysentery, and on 28 Sept. turned aside to Lanercost and joined the queen there (*Chron. Lanercost*, p. 206). The lenity he had hitherto shown in dealing with the Scottish nobles had failed of its purpose, and he now issued a decree that all concerned in the murder of Comyn, and all who sheltered them, should be put to death, and that all who belonged to the party of Bruce should, after conviction, be imprisoned during pleasure, a decree which, considering the habits of the time, certainly cannot be considered excessively rigorous. The English army was successful; Bruce's adherents were dispersed, and he fled for shelter to Ireland. The war was conducted, as all wars between the English and Scots were conducted, with considerable ferocity, and some Scottish prisoners of rank were tried, condemned, and executed with much barbarity. Edward can scarcely be held guiltless of cruelty in these cases, but his cruelty was not purposeless, and his temper, which had no doubt been soured by age, disappointment, and sickness, was severely tried; for these men had broken the oaths of fealty they had made to him, and their falseness threatened to ruin the work on which he had expended so much labour and treasure, and which he believed had been crowned with success. The Countess of Buchan and the sister of Bruce were subjected to an imprisonment of much severity, though they were not treated so harshly as is often stated [see under Comyn, John, third Earl of Buchan]. Edward appears to have remained at Lanercost until about 1 March 1307, suffering much from sickness (*Chron. de Lanercost*, p. 207), and before he left gave directions on 26 Feb. for the banishment of Gaveston, the evil counsellor of his son (*Fœdera*, ii. 1043). He then went to Carlisle to meet his parliament, and remained there. His army was summoned to meet at Carlisle soon after midsummer, and as Bruce had returned and had gained a transient success he determined to take the field in person, and hoping that his health was restored, offered in the cathedral his litter and the horses that drew it, and set out on horseback on Monday, 3 July. His malady returned with increased severity, and that day he only journeyed two miles. Still his spirit was undaunted; he again set out the next day, and again could not ride further than the same distance. On Wednesday he rested, and the next day arrived at Burgh-on-Sands (Trivet, p. 413, *n.* 3). There he took leave of the Prince of Wales; he bade him send his heart to the Holy Land with a hundred knights, who were to serve there for a year; not to bury his body until he had utterly subdued the Scots; and to carry his bones from place to place wherever he should march against them, that so he might still lead the army to victory, and never to recall Gaveston without the common consent of the nation. He died

with, it is said, words of faith in God upon his lips, on Friday, 7 July, at the age of sixty-eight (*Chron. de Lanercost*, p. 108). His son disobeyed his dying commands, and he was buried in Westminster Abbey on 27 Oct. By his first wife, Eleanor of Castile, he had four sons: John and Henry, who died in infancy; Alfonso, who lived to the age of twelve; and Edward, who succeeded him; and nine daughters, four of whom died young. The others were: Eleanor, born in 1266, betrothed to Alfonso of Aragon (*Fœdera*, ii. 214), married Henry III, count of Bar, in 1293, and died in 1298; Joanna, born at Acre in 1272, betrothed in 1278 to Hartmann, son of the Emperor Rudolf (*ib.* 1067), who was drowned in 1281, married first, Gilbert, earl of Gloucester, in 1289, and secondly, in 1296, against the will of her father, a simple knight, Ralph of Monthermer, who thus obtained the earldom of Gloucester (Hemingburgh, ii. 70, records how she defended her conduct in making this marriage), she died in 1307; Margaret, born in 1275, married John, afterwards duke of Brabant, in 1290, and died in 1318; Mary, born in 1279, took the veil at Amesbury in 1284 somewhat against the wish of her father, who yielded in this matter to the urgent request of the queen-mother; she was alive in 1328 (Trivet, p. 310; *Monasticon*, ii. 237–40); Elizabeth, born at Rhuddlan in 1282, and so called the 'Welshwoman' ('Walkiniana,' Cotton, p. 163), married first, John, count of Holland, in 1296, and secondly, Humphrey Bohun, fourth earl of Hereford, in 1302, and died in 1316. By his second wife, Margaret, who survived him, Edward had two sons, Thomas [q. v.], earl of Norfolk, born at Brotherton in 1300, and Edmund [q. v.], earl of Kent, born in 1301, and a daughter who died in infancy.

[Matt. Paris, Chron. Maj.; Royal Letters, Hen. III; Annals of Winchester, Waverley, Dunstaple, and Worcester, and T. Wikes ap. Ann. Monastici; Rishanger's Chron. et Annales; Opus Chronicorum, both ap. Chron. Monast. S. Albani; J. de Oxenedes; B. Cotton; T. Walsingham; Annales London., Chronicles, Edw. I and II; Brut y Tywysogion; Registrum, J. Peckham—all these in Rolls Ser.; Liber de Ant. Legibus; Rishanger's De Bellis, both Camd. Soc.; W. Hemingburgh; N. Trivet; Cont. Florence of Worcester, these three Engl. Hist. Soc.; Adam of Domerham; Robert of Gloucester; P. Langtoft; Fordun's Scotichronicon, these four ed. Hearne; Chron. de Lanercost (Bannatyne Club); Birchington's Anglia Sacra, i.; M. Westminster, Flores Hist. ed. 1570; Rymer's Fœdera, ii. ed. 1705; Wilkins's Concilia, ii.; Stevenson's Documents illustrative of the Hist. of Scotland, Scotch Records; Statutes at Large, ed. Pickering; Stubbs's Const. Hist. ii., Select Charters, and Early Plantagenets; [Seeley's] Life and Reign of Edward I; Blaauw's Barons' War; Pauli's Simon de Montfort; Prothero's Simon de Montfort; Amari's War of the Sicilian Vespers, trans. Earl of Ellesmere; Tytler's Hist. of Scotland, i., 2nd edit.; Burton's Hist. of Scotland, ii. 2nd edit.; Sir H. Nicolas's Hist. of the Royal Navy, i., and Siege of Carlaverock.] W. H.

EDWARD II of Carnarvon (1284–1327), king of England, fourth son of Edward I by his first wife, Eleanor of Castile, was born at the newly erected castle of Carnarvon on St. Mark's day, 25 April 1284. As his parents had spent the greater part of the two previous years in Wales and the borders, his birth at Carnarvon must be regarded as the result of accident rather than the settled policy which later traditions attribute to his father. Entirely apocryphal are the stories of the king presenting his infant son as the future native sovereign of the Welsh (they first appear in Stow, *Annals*, pp. 202–3, and Powel, *Hist. Cambria*, ed. 1584, p. 377). The tradition which fixes the room and tower of the castle in which Edward was born is equally baseless. On 19 Aug. the death of his elder brother Alfonso made Edward his father's heir. He was hardly six years old when the negotiations for his marriage with the infant Queen Margaret of Scotland were successfully completed. In March 1290 the magnates of Scotland assented to the match (*Fœdera*, i. 730), but on 2 Oct. Margaret's death destroyed the best hope of the union of England and Scotland. On 28 Nov. he lost his mother, Queen Eleanor.

At a very early age Edward had a separate household of some magnificence assigned to him. So early as 1294 the townsfolk of Dunstaple bitterly complained of his attendants' rapacity and violence (*Ann. Dunst.* p. 392). In 1296 the negotiations for the marriage of Philippa, the daughter of Count Guy of Flanders, to Edward came to nothing (*Ann. Wig.* p. 529; *Opus Chron.* in Trokelowe, p. 55). On 22 Aug. 1297 Edward became nominal regent during his father's absence in Flanders. The defeat of Earl Warenne at Stirling and the baronial agitation for the confirmation of the charters made his task extremely difficult. On 10 Oct. Edward was obliged to issue the famous 'Confirmatio Cartarum.' In mid-Lent 1298 the king's return ended the regency. Next year a proposal of marriage between Edward and Isabella, the infant daughter of Philip the Fair, was the outcome of the arbitration of Boniface VIII between England and France (*Fœdera*, i. 954). Not until 20 May 1303, however, did the definite betrothal take place

at Paris, and even then the youth of the parties compelled a further postponement of their union.

On 7 Feb. 1301 Edward was created Prince of Wales and Earl of Chester at the famous Lincoln parliament (*Ann. Wig.* p. 548). This step was highly popular throughout Wales (*Ann. Edw. I* in RISHANGER, p. 464), and marked Edward's entrance into more active life. In 1302 he was first summoned to parliament. Henceforth he regularly accompanied his father on his campaigns against Scotland. In the summer of 1301 he led the western wing of the invading army from Carlisle (*Chron. de Lanercost*, p. 200, Bannatyne Club), but soon joined his father, and spent the winter with him at Linlithgow (*ib.*; *Ann. Wig.* 551), though he was back early enough to hold, in March 1302, a council for his father at London (*Ann. Lond.* in STUBBS, *Chron. Edw. I and II*, i. 127). In 1303 and 1304 Edward was again in Scotland, and though on one occasion the old king commended his strategy, and always kept him well employed, the entries on his expenses rolls for these years suggest that he had already acquired habits of frivolity and extravagance. He often lost large sums at dice, and sometimes had to borrow from his servants to pay his debts. He was attended on his travels by a lion and by Genoese fiddlers. He had to compensate a fool for the rough practical jokes he had played on him (*Cal. Doc. Scotland*, ii. No. 1413). Among his gambling agents was the Gascon, Piers de Gaveston [q. v.], who had already acquired a fatal ascendency over him. Walter Reynolds, perhaps his tutor, and afterwards keeper of his wardrobe, was an almost equally undesirable confidant. Yet the old king spared no pains to instruct him in habits of business as much as in the art of war. Accident has preserved the roll of the prince's letters between November 1304 and November 1305. They are more than seven hundred in number, and yet incomplete, and show conclusively the careful drilling the young prince underwent (*Ninth Report of Deputy-Keeper of Records*, app. ii. pp. 246–9.) But it was all in vain. In June 1305 he invaded the woods of Bishop Langton, the treasurer, and returned the minister's remonstrances with insult. The king was moved to deep wrath; banished his son from court for six months and ordered him to make full reparation (*Chron. Edw. I and II*, i. xxxix, 138; *Abbrev. Plac.* i. 257; *Ninth Report*, p. 247). In August Edward wrote a whining letter to his step-mother, begging her to induce the king to let him have the company of Gilbert de Clare and 'Perot de Gaveston' to alleviate the anguish caused by the stern orders of his father (*Ninth Report*, p. 248). In October, however, the king allowed Edward to represent him at a great London banquet (*Ann. Lond.* p. 143).

The revolt of Scotland opened out new prospects. Edward I, declining in years and health, again endeavoured to prepare his unworthy son for the English throne. At Easter 1306 the Prince of Wales received a grant of Gascony (TRIVET, p. 408). On Whitsunday he was solemnly dubbed knight at Westminster, along with three hundred chosen noble youths. Immediately after the ceremony the new warriors set out for Scotland, solemnly pledged to revenge the murder of Comyn. The prince's particular vow was never to rest twice in one place until full satisfaction was obtained. Edward and the young men preceded the slower movements of his father; but his merciless devastation of the Scottish borders moved the indignation of the old king (RISHANGER, pp. 229–30; TRIVET, pp. 408, 411). Edward continued engaged on the campaign until in January 1307 his presence at the Carlisle parliament was required (*Parl. Writs*, i. 81) to meet the Cardinal Peter of Spain, who was commissioned to conclude the long-protracted marriage treaty with the daughter of France. But Edward's demand of Ponthieu, his mother's heritage, for Gaveston provoked a new outbreak of wrath from the old king (HEMINGBURGH, ii. 272). On 26 Feb. Gaveston was banished, though about a month later Edward was sufficiently restored to favour for the king to make arrangements for his visiting France to be married (*Fœdera*, i. 1012); but on 7 July the death of Edward I removed the last restraint on his son.

In person the new king was almost as striking a man as Edward I. He was tall, handsome, and of exceptional bodily strength ('Et si fust de son corps un des plus fortz hom de soun realme,' *Scalachronica*, p. 136, Maitland Club). But though well fitted to excel in martial exercises, he never showed any real inclination for a warlike life, or even for the tournament. As soon as he was his own master he avoided fighting as much as he could, and when compelled to take the field his conduct was that of an absolute craven. Lack of earnest purpose blasted his whole character. He had been trained as a warrior, but never became one. He had been drilled in the routine of business, but had only derived from it an absolute incapacity to devote himself to any serious work. His only object in life was to gratify the whim of the moment, reckless of consequences. Much of his folly and levity may be set down to habitual deep drink-

ing. His favourite pastimes were of a curiously unkingly nature. He disliked the society of his equals among the youthful nobility, and, save for a few attached friends, his favourite companions were men of low origin and vulgar tastes. With them Edward would exercise his remarkable dexterity in the mechanical arts. He was fond of smith's work, was proud of his skill at digging trenches and thatching houses. He was also a good athlete, fond of racing and driving, and of the society of watermen and grooms. He was passionately devoted to horses and hounds and their breeding. He bought up the famous stud of Earl Warenne, which he kept at Ditchling in Sussex. At one time he borrows from Archbishop Winchelsey a 'beal cheval bon pour estaloun,' at another he gets a white greyhound of a rare breed from his sister. He boasted of his Welsh harriers that could discover a hare sleeping, and was hardly less proud of the 'gentz sauvages' from his native land, who were in his household to train them. He was also a musician, and beseeches the abbot of Shrewsbury to lend him a remarkably good fiddler to teach his rhymer the crowther, and borrows trumpets and kettledrums from Reynolds for his little players. He was devoted to the stage, and Reynolds first won his favour, it was said, by his skill 'in ludis theatralibus' (Monk of Malmesbury, p. 197). He was not well educated, and took the coronation oath in the French form, provided for a king ignorant of Latin. He was fond of fine clothes, and with all his taste for low society liked pomp and state on occasions. He had the facile good nature of some thoroughly weak men. Without confidence in himself, and conscious probably of the contempt of his subjects, he was never without some favourite of stronger will than his own for whom he would show a weak and nauseous affection. Sometimes with childlike passion he would personally chastise those who provoked his wrath. He could never keep silence, but disclosed freely even secrets of state. He had no dignity or self-respect. His household was as disorderly as their master's example and poverty made it. The commons groaned under the exactions of his purveyors and collectors. The notion that he neglected the nobility out of settled policy to rely upon the commons is futile. Even less trustworthy is the contention that his troubles were due to his zeal for retrenchment and financial reform to pay his father's debts and get free from the bondage of the Italian merchants. (For Edward's character the chief authorities are Malmesbury, pp. 191–2; Knighton, in Twysden, c. 2531–2; Bridlington, p. 91; *Ann. de Melsa*, ii. 280, 286; *Cont.* Trivet, p. 18; *Lanercost*, p. 236; *Scalachronica*, p. 136; and for his habits Blaauw in *Sussex Arch. Collections*, ii. 80–98, and the *Ninth Report of Deputy-Keeper*, app. ii. 246–9; for his finances, Mr. Bond's article in *Archæologia*, xxviii. 246–54; and the summary of wardrobe accounts for 10, 11, and 14 Edw. II in *Archæologia*, xxvi. 318–45).

Edward I's policy underwent a complete reversion on his son's accession. After his father's death the new king hurried north to Carlisle, where he arrived on 18 July, and after visiting Burgh next day he received on 20 July the homage of the English magnates then gathered in the north. He then advanced into Scotland, and on 31 July received at Dumfries the homage of such Scottish lords as still adhered to him (*Ann. Lanercost*, p. 209). But after a few weeks, during which he accomplished absolutely nothing, he left Aymer de Valence as guardian of Scotland, and journeyed to the south after his father's body. He had already been joined by Gaveston, whom, on 6 Aug., he had made Earl of Cornwall, despite the murmurs of the majority of the barons. He now dismissed with scanty courtesy his father's ministers, wreaked his spite on Langton by pilfering his treasure and immuring him in the Tower. Langton's successor at the treasury was Walter Reynolds, Edward's old favourite. The acquiescence of the Earl of Lincoln in the elevation of Gaveston saved him for a time from the fate of Langton and Baldock. On 13 Oct. Edward held a short parliament at Northampton, whence he went to Westminster for the burial of his father on 27 Oct. On 29 Oct. he betrothed Gaveston to his niece, Margaret of Gloucester (*Cont.* Trivet, ed. Hall, 1722, p. 3), and also appointed him regent on his departure for France to do homage for Gascony and wed his promised bride. On 22 Jan. 1308 Edward crossed from Dover to Boulogne (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 13), and on 25 Jan. his marriage with Isabella of France was celebrated with great pomp in the presence of Philip the Fair and a great gathering of French and English magnates (*Ann. Lond.* p. 152; *Ann. Paul.* p. 258. Hemingburgh, ii. 270, wrongly dates the marriage on 28 Jan., and Bridlington, p. 32, on 24 Jan.) On 7 Feb. the royal pair arrived at Dover (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 13), and after a magnificent reception at London the coronation was performed on 25 Feb. with great state at Westminster. The minute records of the ceremony (*Fœdera*, ii. 33–6) show that the coronation oath taken by the new monarch was stricter than the older form, and involved a more definite reference to the rights of the commons. The disgust occasioned by Edward's infatuation for Gaveston had nearly broken up the coronation

festivities, and the king's fear for the favourite's safety had induced him to postpone the February council till Easter. The queen's uncles left England in great disgust that Edward neglected his bride for the society of his 'brother Peter' (*Ann. Paul.* p. 262). The magnates complained that the foreign upstart treated them with contempt, and deprived them of their constitutional part in the government of the country. The whole nation was incensed that everything should be in the hands of the 'king's idol.' When the great council met on 30 April, it sharply warned Edward that homage was due rather to the crown than to the king's person, and frightened him into consenting to the banishment of the favourite before 25 June. Gaveston was compelled to bend before the storm, and to surrender his earldom (*ib.* p. 263); but Edward heaped fresh grants on him and remained in his society until he embarked at Bristol. He made him regent of Ireland, with a vast revenue, pressed the pope to absolve him from the excommunication threatened if he returned, and soon began to actively intrigue for his restoration. At the Northampton parliament in August a nominal understanding between the king and the barons was arrived at. His bad counsellors were removed from office, and Langton soon after released from prison; yet a tournament held by the king at Kennington proved a failure through the neglect of the magnates. At last, on 27 April 1309, Edward was compelled to confront the three estates at Westminster, and as the price of a twenty-fifth to receive eleven articles of grievances, which he was to answer in the next parliament (*Rot. Parl.* i. 443–5). But his proposal that Gaveston should retain the earldom of Cornwall was rejected (Hemingburgh, ii. 275), though his intrigues succeeded so far that the chief barons were won over individually to consent or acquiesce in his restoration. Only the Earl of Warwick resisted the royal blandishments (Malmesbury, p. 160). The pope was induced to absolve Gaveston from his oaths (*Ann. Lond.* p. 157; Malmesbury, p. 161). In July he ventured back to England, and was received with open arms by Edward at Chester. So effectually had Edward's intrigues broken up the baronial opposition that no one ventured openly to object to the favourite's return. At a baronial parliament at Stamford on 27 July Edward courted popular favour by accepting the articles of 1309, while Gloucester succeeded in persuading the magnates to a formal reconciliation with Gaveston, and even to his restoration to the earldom of Cornwall. But the favourite's behaviour was as insolent as ever. Lancaster soon raised the standard of opposition. Along with the Earls of Lincoln, Warwick, Oxford, and Arundel, he refused to attend a council summoned at York for October (Hemingburgh, ii. 275). Edward, as usual, sought by postponing its session to escape from his difficulties. He celebrated his Christmas court at his favourite palace of Langley ('locum quem rex valde dilexit,' Malm. p. 162). At last, in March 1310, the long-postponed meeting of magnates was held in London. The barons attended in military array; Edward's attempted opposition at once broke down. On 16 March threats of the withdrawal of allegiance compelled him to consent to the appointment (*Fœdera*, ii. 105) of the twenty-one lords ordainers, into whose hands all royal power was practically bestowed. But the limitation of his prerogative affected Edward much less than the danger of Gaveston, against whom the chief designs of the ordainers was directed. In February Gaveston left the court. As soon as the council had ended Edward hurried to the north to rejoin his favourite, and, under the pretence of warring against Bruce, keep Gaveston out of harm's way, while avoiding the unpleasant presence of the ordainers, and escaping from the necessity of obeying a summons for an interview with the king of France (*ib.* ii. 110; Malm. p. 165). But only two earls, Gloucester and Warenne, attended the 'copiosa turba peditum' that formed the chief support of the royal army. On 8 Sept. the host assembled at Berwick. By 16 Sept. the king was at Roxburgh, and by 13 Oct. at Linlithgow; but no enemy was to be found even if Edward were in earnest in seeking one. Bruce, though he boasted that he feared the bones of the old king more than his living successor, refrained from fighting. By the beginning of November Edward had returned to Berwick (Hartshorne, *Itinerary of Ed. II*, p. 119), where he remained almost entirely till the end of July 1311. In February (1311), Lincoln, the regent, died, and Lancaster, his son-in-law, succeeded to his estates. After much difficulty Edward was persuaded to go a few miles south into England to receive his homage for this property. At their meeting they observed the externals of friendship, but Lancaster's refusal to salute Gaveston made Edward very angry (*Lanercost*, p. 215). The need of meeting the ordainers at last brought Edward back to the south, leaving Gaveston at Bamborough for safety. But he got to London before the magnates were ready, and, spending August (1311) on a pilgrimage to Canterbury, returned to meet the ordainers about the end of that month. The ordinances were soon presented to him, but in the long catalogue of reforms that were demanded he saw nothing

of importance save the articles requiring the exile of Gaveston. In vain he offered to consent to all other ordinances to stay the persecution of his brother Peter and leave him in possession of Cornwall. At last, when he saw clearly that civil war was the alternative, he gave an insincere and reluctant consent to them on 5 Oct. Gaveston at once left England for Flanders, while the barons removed his kinsfolk and adherents from the royal household. Edward was now intensely disturbed, and complained that the barons treated him like an idiot by taking out of his hands every detail even of the management of his own household. He was detained till the middle of December in London by fresh sittings of parliament, at which very little was done. At the end of November there was a rumour that Gaveston had returned and was hiding in the west; before Christmas he openly visited the king at Windsor (*Ann. Lond.* p. 202), and early in the new year went with Edward to the north. On 18 Jan. 1312 the king issued a writ announcing the favourite's return and approving his loyalty (*Fœdera*, ii. 153). In February he restored him his estates (*ib.* ii. 157). Open war necessarily resulted. Winchelsey excommunicated the favourite. Lancaster and his confederates took arms. In vain Edward sought to purchase the safety of Gaveston in Scotland by recognising Bruce as king, but Edward's alliance was not worth buying. He was at the time so miserably poor that he could only get supplies by devastating a country already cruelly ravaged by the Scots (*Lanercost*, pp. 218–19). On 10 April (Bridlington, p. 42) the king and his favourite were at Newcastle. Thence they hastily retreated to Tynemouth, but Lancaster now captured Newcastle, and the pair, regardless of the queen's entreaties, fled in a boat to Scarborough (10 May), where Edward left Peter while he withdrew to York to divert the baronial forces. But Lancaster occupied the intervening country while the other earls besieged Scarborough, where Gaveston surrendered to Pembroke on condition that he should be unharmed till 1 Aug. Edward accepted these terms and set to work to interest the pope and the king of France for Gaveston, hoping that the cession of Gascony would be a sufficient bribe to make Philip support his old enemy (Malmesbury, p. 177). But the treachery of the barons, the seizure of Gaveston by Warwick, and his murder on Blacklow Hill (19 June) showed that all the bad faith was not on Edward's side. Edward was powerless to do more than pay the last honours to his dead friend. The body found a last resting-place at Langley, where a house of black friars was established by Edward to pray for the deceased favourite's soul (Knighton, c. 2533). The Earls of Pembroke and Warenne never forgave Lancaster. Henceforth they formed with Hugh le Despenser [q. v.] and Edward's other personal adherents a party strong enough to prevent further attacks upon the king. After wearisome marches and negotiations, the mediation of Gloucester, the papal envoy and Lewis of Evreux, the queen's uncle, led to the proclamation of peace on 22 Dec. 1312 (*Fœdera*, ii. 191–2). On 13 Nov. the birth of a son, afterwards Edward III, had turned the king's mind further from Gaveston. Nearly a year elapsed before the earls made the personal submission stipulated in the treaty, and as parliamentary resources were still withheld Edward was plunged into an extreme destitution that could only be partly met by loans from every quarter available, by laying his hands on as much as he could of the confiscated estates of the Templars, and by tallages that provoked riots in London and Bristol. In May 1313 the death of Winchelsey further weakened the baronial party, and Edward prevailed on the pope to quash the election of the eminent scholar Thomas Cobham [q.v.] in favour of his creature, Walter Reynolds. But the prospects of real peace were still very dark. Under the pretence of illness Edward kept away from the spring parliament in 1313 (Malmesbury, p. 190). In May he and the queen, accompanied by a magnificent court, crossed the Channel and attended the great festivities given on Whitsunday by Philip the Fair at Paris, when his three sons, the Duke of Burgundy, and a number of noble youths were dubbed knights before the magnates of the realm (*ib.* 190; *Cont.* Guillaume de Nangis, i. 395–6; Martin, *Hist. of France*, iv. 501). They returned on 16 July (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 101) and reached London only to find that the barons summoned to the July parliament had already returned to their homes in disgust. By such transparent artifices the weak king postponed the settlement until a new parliament that sat between September and November. There at last the three earls publicly humiliated themselves before the king in Westminster Hall in the presence of the assembled magnates (Trokelowe, pp. 80, 81). Feasts of reconciliation were held, and nothing save the continued enmity of Lancaster and Hugh le Despenser remained of the old quarrels. On 16 Oct. the pardon and amnesty to the three earls and over four hundred minor offenders were issued (*Fœdera*, ii. 230–1). Parliament now made Edward a much-needed grant of money. The first troubles of the reign were thus finally appeased. Between 12 Dec. and 20 Dec.

(*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 109) Edward made a short pilgrimage to Boulogne, but his journey was a secret one, and undertaken against the opinion of his subjects (*Cont.* TRIVET, ed. Hall, p. 11). The question of the ordinances was still unsettled, and soon became the source of fresh difficulties.

On 17 Feb. 1314 Edward attended the enthronement of Reynolds at Canterbury. On 28 Feb. Roxburgh was captured by Bruce; on 13 March Edinburgh fell, and soon after Stirling, the last of the Scottish strongholds that remained in English hands, promised to surrender if not relieved by St. John's day (24 June). Edward was provoked almost to tears by these disasters, and eagerly pressed the leading earls to march against Bruce with all their forces. The earls replied that to undertake such an expedition without the consent of parliament would be contrary to the ordinances. Edward was compelled, therefore, to rely upon the customary services of his vassals, whom he convoked for 10 June. After visiting for Easter the great abbeys of St. Albans and Ely (TROKELOWE, p. 83), Edward started for the north. A great host tardily collected at Berwick, but Lancaster, Warenne, Arundel, and Warwick stayed behind, though furnishing their legal contingent of troops. At last, about a week before St. John's day, Edward left Berwick for Stirling with as much confidence as if he were on a pilgrimage to Compostella (MALMESBURY, p. 202). When the great army, greatly fatigued by the march, reached the neighbourhood of Stirling, St. John's eve had arrived. A defeat in a preliminary skirmish and a sleepless and riotous night (T. DE LA MOOR, p. 299) still further unfitted the army for action. Gloucester strongly urged the king to wait another day before fighting; but in a characteristic outburst Edward denounced his nephew as a traitor, and ordered an immediate action. The English army was divided into three lines, in the rearmost of which Edward remained with the bishops and monks in attendance, and protected by Hugh le Despenser. The first line soon fell into confusion, and Gloucester, its leader, was slain. The royal escort at once resolved that Edward must withdraw to a place of safety; and the king, after requesting in vain admittance into Stirling Castle, hurried off towards Dunbar, hotly pursued by the enemy. Thence he took ship for Berwick. The retreat of the king was the signal for the flight of the whole army. Stirling surrendered, and all Scotland acknowledged as its king the victor of Bannockburn.

Meanwhile Lancaster had assembled an army at Pontefract, on the pretext that Edward, if successful in Scotland, had resolved to turn his victorious troops against the confederate earls. Edward was compelled to make an unconditional submission at a parliament at York in September, to confirm the ordinances, to change his ministers, and to receive the earls into favour. Hugh le Despenser remained in hiding. About Christmas time Edward celebrated Gaveston's final obsequies at Langley (MALMESBURY, p. 209). In the February parliament at London the victorious barons removed Despenser and Walter Langton from the council, purged the royal household of its superfluous and burdensome members, and put the king on an allowance of 10*l.* a day. The humiliation of Edward was furthered by the appointment of Lancaster as commander-in-chief against the Scots in August, and completed by the acts of the parliament of Lincoln in January 1316, where it was 'ordained that the king should undertake no important matter without the consent of the council, and that Lancaster should hold the position of chief of the council' (*ib.* p. 224).

Edward had thus fallen completely under Lancaster's power. The invasion of Ireland by Edward Bruce, the revolt of Llewelyn Bren in Wales, the revolt of Banastre against Lancaster, the Scottish devastations extending as far south as Furness (*Lanercost*, p. 233), the Bristol war in 1316, aggravated by the floods of 1315 and the plague of cattle, the unheard-of scarcity of corn and the unhealthiness of the season of 1316 showed that a stronger rule was required. But Lancaster failed almost as signally as Edward. After Michaelmas he attempted a Scottish expedition; but Edward now refused to follow him, so the earl returned, having accomplished nothing (*ib.* p. 233). His failure to carry a new series of ordinances drove him into a sulky retirement. This attitude again restored freedom to Edward and his courtiers. The king's application to the pope to be relieved from his oath to the ordinances, and for the condemnation of the Scots, failed of its purpose. But the baronial party was now broken up, and Edward vigorously intrigued to win to his side the middle party, led by Pembroke, Badlesmere, and D'Amory, husband of one of the Gloucester coheiresses. With this party hatred of Lancaster was stronger than dislike of the royal policy. The abduction of the Countess of Lancaster by Earl Warenne, planned, it was believed, by Edward and his courtiers (*Cont.* TRIVET, p. 21), produced a new crisis. Private war broke out between Warenne and Lancaster in Yorkshire. In July Edward went north, and under pretence of the Scots war assembled in September an

army at York that was really directed against Lancaster, who in his turn collected troops at Pontefract. Both parties watched each other for some time, but no actual hostilities followed. At the end of July the mediation of Pembroke and the cardinal legates resulted in a reference of all disputes to a parliament to meet at Lincoln in January 1318. Yet even after this Edward, on his way to London, marched in arms under the walls of Pontefract (*ib.* pp. 23–4), but Pembroke's strong remonstrances prevented any attack on Lancaster's stronghold. The wearisome negotiations were still far from ended. The parliament originally summoned for January was postponed month after month. On 2 April the capture of Berwick by the Scots was a new indication of the need of union. Nevertheless at the council which was held on 12 April at Leicester another scheme of reconciliation broke down. All July the king was at Northampton, while the chancellor went backwards and forwards to negotiate with Lancaster. On 31 July a pardon was issued; on 14 Aug. a personal meeting of the cousins was held at Hathern, near Loughborough, where they exchanged the kiss of peace with apparent cordiality (Knighton, c. 2534). In October a parliament at York ratified the new treaty. It was a complete triumph for the foes of Edward. The ordinances were again confirmed, and a permanent council was appointed, which practically put the royal authority into commission.

The bad seasons still continued; the Scots' ravages extended; the court grew more needy; law was everywhere disregarded; while the imposture of John of Powderham at Oxford only gave expression to the general belief that so degenerate a son of the great Edward might well be a changeling. The Scottish war kept Edward in the north for the greater part of the next two years. The court, which removed to York in October 1318, remained there almost continually until January 1320. In March 1319 a second parliament met at York and made a liberal grant for the Scottish expedition (Bridlington, p. 56). The pope now confirmed the sentence of the legates against the Scots. At the end of August Edward and Lancaster laid siege to Berwick. In September the Scots ravaged Yorkshire in the rear of the besiegers, and a plan to carry off the queen from York very nearly succeeded (Malmesbury, p. 243). On 12 Sept. Archbishop Melton was severely defeated by them at Myton-on-Swale, and the enemy plundered as far as Pontefract. Edward was thus forced to raise the siege of Berwick, but entirely failed to cut off the Scots in Yorkshire. It was believed that Lancaster was bribed by the Scots, but incompetence and disunion quite account for the failure. A two years' truce was arranged. In January 1320 Edward held a council of magnates at York, which Lancaster as usual refused to attend. He then went south with his queen, entering London on 16 Feb. On 19 June he and his queen sailed for France (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 244). Before the high altar at Amiens Cathedral he performed his long-delayed homage for Ponthieu and Aquitaine to Philip V, put down a mutiny of his subjects at Abbeville, and on 20 July attended at Boulogne the consecration of Burghersh, Badlesmere's nephew, to the bishopric of Lincoln. He returned to England on 22 July (*Fœdera*, ii. 428), and on 2 Aug. made a solemn entry into London. On 13 Oct. he held a parliament at Westminster, which Lancaster again refused to attend. For the next few months the unwonted quiet continued.

Since Edward had put himself in the hands of Pembroke and Badlesmere he had enjoyed comparative security and dignity. Only when great enterprises were attempted was Lancaster still in a position to break up the government of the country. But Edward loved neither Pembroke nor his allies, and had now found in the younger Hugh le Despenser [q. v.] a congenial successor to Gaveston. The increasing favour shown by Edward to father and son, the revival of the old court following under their leadership, and the extensive grants lavished on them by the king, made them both hated and feared. As the husband of the eldest of the three Gloucester coheiresses, the younger Despenser's ambition was to obtain the Gloucester earldom. Early in 1321 private war had broken out in South Wales between him and the neighbouring marchers, among whom were Audley and Amory, his rivals for the Gloucester inheritance. Edward in vain attempted to protect Despenser. He approached so near the scene of action as Gloucester. As soon as he went back towards London Despenser's lands in Wales were overrun. Meanwhile Lancaster and the northern lords held on 28 June a meeting at Sherburn in Elmet, and resolved to maintain the cause of the marchers. Pembroke and Badlesmere also took the same side, after Edward had rejected their advice to dismiss Despenser. On 15 July parliament met at Westminster, and Edward was finally compelled to accept their sentence of forfeiture and banishment. The elder Despenser immediately withdrew to foreign parts, but his son took to the high seas and piracy.

Edward as usual was spurred by the mis-

fortune of his favourites into activity, and cleverly took advantage of the want of harmony between the various elements arrayed against him to prepare the way for Hugh's return. An accident favoured his design. On 13 Oct. 1321 the queen, on her way to Canterbury, requested the hospitality of Lady Badlesmere in Leeds Castle. The doors were closed against her; six of her men were slain in the tumult that ensued. Edward was terribly roused by this insult to his wife. He at once took arms, and besieged Leeds Castle with such vigour that on 31 Oct. it capitulated. During this time an army, said to be thirty thousand strong, had gathered round Edward's standard. Six earls and many magnates were in his camp. Lancaster, in his hatred of Badlesmere, had taken no measures to counteract Edward's plans. The fall of Leeds gave Edward courage to unfold his real designs. On 10 Dec. he extorted from the convocation of clergy their opinion that the proceedings against the Despensers were illegal. He ordered the seizure of the castles of the western lands, and himself marched westwards at the head of his forces and kept his Christmas court at Cirencester. His object now was to cross the Severn; but Gloucester was occupied by the barons, and at Worcester he found the right bank guarded by armed men. At Bridgnorth, Shropshire, the Mortimers headed the resistance, and in the struggle that ensued the town was burnt. Thence he proceeded to Shrewsbury, where the Mortimers, afraid to risk a battle in the absence of the long-expected Lancaster, allowed him to cross the river, and finally surrendered themselves into his hands. Edward now wandered through the middle and southern marches, and took without resistance the main strongholds of his enemies. At Hereford he sharply reproved the bishop for his treason; thence, returning to Gloucester, he forced Maurice of Berkeley to surrender that town and Berkeley itself. On 11 Feb. 1322 Edward issued at Gloucester writs for the recall of the Despensers (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 276). He thence proceeded to the midlands, where the northern lords, thoroughly frightened into activity, were now besieging Tickhill. On 28 Feb. the royal levies assembled at Coventry, but Lancaster, after endeavouring to defend the passage of the Trent at Burton, fled to the north, where Sir Andrew Harclay was turning against the traitors the forces collected against the Scotch. The king's triumph was now assured. Tutbury and Kenilworth surrendered, Lancaster's most trusty officers deserted him, and Roger D'Amory fell dying into the king's hands. Lancaster and Hereford, unable to find shelter even at Pontefract, hurried northwards to join the Scots. On 16 March they were met by Harclay at Boroughbridge, Yorkshire, where Hereford was slain and Lancaster captured. Five days later Edward presided over Lancaster's hasty and irregular trial at his own castle of Pontefract. Refused even a hearing, he was beheaded the next day. The perpetual imprisonment of the Mortimers and Audley, the hanging of Badlesmere at Canterbury, the execution of about thirty lesser offenders, completed the signal triumph of Edward and the Despensers. On 2 May a full parliament met at York, finally revoked the ordinances, and, in opposition to the baronial oligarchy that had so long fettered the action of Edward, laid down the principle that all weighty affairs of state should proceed from the counsel and consent of king, clergy, lords, and commons. The issue of some new ordinances of Edward's own was perhaps intended to show that the king, no less than Earl Thomas, was willing to confer the benefits of good government on his people.

The troubles were no sooner over than, at the end of July (1322), Edward undertook a new expedition against Scotland, the truce having already expired; but the invasion was no more successful than his other martial exploits. Berwick was besieged, but to no purpose. Bruce withdrew over the Forth, leaving Lothian desolate. Before September Edward was defeated by pestilence and famine rather than by the enemy (*Lanercost*, pp. 247–8). On his return to England Bruce followed in his wake. About Michaelmas Edward was nearly captured at Byland Abbey. He fled as far as Bridlington. The parliament, summoned to Ripon on 14 Nov., was unable to meet further north than York. In January 1323 Harclay turned traitor, making his private treaty with the Scots (*ib.* p. 248), justified, it was thought in the north, by the king's inability to defend his realm. At last, on 30 May (*Fœdera*, ii. 521), a truce for thirteen years ended Edward's vain attempts to subdue Scotland.

From 1322 to 1326 Edward reigned in comparative tranquillity under the guidance of the Despensers. Some slight attempts to assail the Despensers were easily put down; but the deplorable condition of the country and the miserable poverty of the royal exchequer were from the beginning the chief dangers of the new government. The Despensers showed little capacity as administrators, and their greed and insolence soon caused old hatreds to be revived. In particular, Queen Isabella became a furious enemy of the younger Despenser, by whose counsel, it was believed, she was on 28 Sept. 1324 deprived of her lands and servants, and

limited to an allowance of twenty shillings a day (*Lanercost*, p. 254; *Ann. Paul.* p. 307). Meanwhile Edward offended some of the most important of his old friends. He alienated Archbishop Reynolds by making the Archbishop of York his treasurer; his treatment of Badlesmere had already made Burghersh a secret foe; new men, like Stratford and Ayreminne, disliked Edward for opposing their promotion. With even greater folly Edward provoked a quarrel with Henry, earl of Leicester, the brother and heir of Thomas of Lancaster (Malmesbury, pp. 280–1). On 1 Aug. 1324 Roger Mortimer escaped from the Tower to France, where he became a nucleus of disaffection. Thus Edward gradually alienated all his possible supporters, and, quite careless or unconscious of his isolation, was left to face the indignation of a misgoverned nation, and the rancorous hatred of leaders of embittered factions.

A new danger now came from France. Charles IV, who had succeeded Philip V in 1322, had long been clamouring that Edward should perform homage to him for Aquitaine and Ponthieu. In June 1324 Pembroke, the last influential and faithful friend of Edward, died at Paris while attempting to satisfy the French king's demands. Edmund of Kent [q. v.], who had been sent to Paris in April, proved a sorry diplomatist. Before the end of the year actual hostilities commenced by a French attack on Gascony.

All could have been easily settled if Edward had crossed over and performed homage. But the Despensers were afraid to let him escape from their hands, and on 9 March 1325 Edward gave way to the blandishments of his queen, and allowed her to visit her brother's court as his representative. It was not Isabella's policy to settle the differences between her brother and husband. She procured the prolongation of a truce until 1 Aug., while Edward, whose arbitrary proceedings in the early summer had provoked discontent without actual resistance, met his parliament at London on 25 June, when the magnates strongly expressed their opinion that he should immediately go to France.

Edward pretended to make preparations for his departure, but gladly availed himself of a proposal of the French king that he should give Gascony to his eldest son, and that the homage of the latter should be accepted in place of his. On 12 Sept. the young Duke of Aquitaine sailed to France, and before the end of the month performed homage to Charles IV at Vincennes.

Edward now recalled Isabella to England, but she absolutely refused to go as long as Hugh le Despenser remained in power. Edward laid his grievances before the parliament which sat at Westminster between 18 Nov. and 5 Dec., and requested mediation. A letter from the bishops had no effect either on Isabella or her son. Early in December Edward wrote strong letters to Charles, to Isabella, and to the young Edward (*Fœdera*, ii. 615–16). All through the spring of 1326 he plied them alternately with prayers and threats, but all to no purpose. It was now plain that Isabella had formed with Mortimer and the other exiles at Paris a deliberate plan for overthrowing the Despensers, if not of dethroning Edward himself. The king's ambassador, his brother, the Count of Hainault, whose daughter was betrothed to the Duke of Aquitaine, joined them. On 24 Sept. 1326 Isabella and her followers landed at Orwell in Suffolk, and received, immediately on landing, such support as insured her triumph.

Edward meanwhile had made frantic and futile efforts in self-defence; but his parliaments and councils would give him no aid, his followers deserted him, and the armies he summoned never assembled. In August (1326) he was at Clarendon, Porchester, and Romsey, whence he returned to London, and took up his abode in the Tower. On 27 Sept. he received in London the news of Isabella's arrival. He had in previous times made efforts to conciliate the Londoners, but it was all in vain. On 2 Oct. he fled westwards with the chancellor Baldock and the younger Despenser, doubtless with the object of taking refuge on his favourite's estates in South Wales, and relying with too great rashness on the promise of the Welsh and his popularity with them (T. de la Moor, p. 309). On 10 and 11 Oct. he was at Gloucester, whence he issued an abortive summons of the neighbourhood to arms. Next day he was at Westbury-on-Severn, in the Forest of Dean. On 14 Oct. he was at Tintern, and from 16 to 21 Oct. at Chepstow (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 451–452), whence he despatched the elder Despenser to Bristol, where on 26 Oct. he met his fate. On the same day the proclamation of the Duke of Aquitaine as guardian of the realm showed that success had given the confederates wider hopes than the destruction of the Despensers and the avenging of Earl Thomas (*Fœdera*, ii. 646).

Edward next made an attempt to take ship for Lundy, whither he had already sent supplies as to a safe refuge; but contrary winds prevented his landing (T. de la Moor, p. 309), and he again disembarked in Glamorgan. On 27 and 28 Oct. he was at Cardiff. On 28 and 29 Oct. he was at Caerphilly, still issuing from both places writs of summons and commissions of array (*Fœdera*, ii. 646; *Parl. Writs*,

II. i. 453). Between 5 and 10 Nov. he was at Neath beseeching the men of Gower to come to his aid (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 454). On 10 Nov. he sent the abbot of Neath and others to negotiate with the queen. Meanwhile Henry of Lancaster and Rhys ap Howel, a Welsh clerk newly released from the Tower by the queen, were specially despatched to effect his capture. Bribes and spies soon made his retreat known. On 16 Nov. the king and all his party fell into the hands of the enemy, and were conducted to the castle of Llantrissaint (*Ann. Paul.* p. 319; KNIGHTON, c. 2545, says they were captured at Neath). On 20 Nov. Baldock and the younger Despenser were handed over to the queen at Hereford, where they were speedily executed. On the same day Edward, who had been retained in the custody of Lancaster, was compelled to surrender the great seal to Bishop Adam of Orlton at Monmouth (*Fœdera*, ii. 646). Edward was thence despatched to Kenilworth, where he remained the whole winter, still in Lancaster's custody, and treated honourably and generously by his magnanimous captor.

A parliament assembled at Westminster on 7 Jan. 1327. At Orlton's instigation the estates chose Edward, duke of Aquitaine, as their king. Bishop Stratford drew up six articles justifying Edward's deposition. But a formal resignation was thought desirable by the queen's advisers. Two efforts were made to persuade Edward to meet the parliament (*Parl. Writs*, II. i. 457; *Lanercost*, p. 257), but on his resolute refusal a committee of the bishops, barons, and judges was sent to Kenilworth. On 20 Jan. Edward, clothed in black, gave them audience. At first he fainted, but, recovering himself, he listened with tears and groans to an address of Orlton's. Then Sir W. Trussell, as proctor of parliament, renounced homage to him, and Sir T. Blount, the steward of the household, broke his staff of office. Edward now spoke, lamenting his ill-fortune and his trust in traitorous counsellors, but rejoicing that his son would now be king (KNIGHTON, c. 2550). The deputation then departed, and Edward II's reign was at an end.

The deposed king remained at Kenilworth until the spring, on the whole patiently bearing his sufferings, but complaining bitterly of his separation from his wife and children. Some curious verses are preserved which are said to have been written by him (they are given in Latin in FABIAN, p. 185, but the French original is given in a manuscript at Longleat, *Hist. MSS. Commission*, 3rd Rep. 180). The government of Isabella and Mortimer was, however, too insecure to allow Edward to remain alive, and a possible instrument of their degradation. He was transferred at the suggestion of Orlton from the mild custody of his cousin to that of two knights, Thomas de Gournay and John Maltravers, who on 3 April removed him by night from Kenilworth. Such secrecy enveloped his subsequent movements that very different accounts of them have been preserved. Sir T. de la Moor (pp. 315–19), who has preserved the most circumstantial narrative (but cf. *Archæologia*, xxvii. 274, 297), says he was taken first to Corfe Castle and thence to Bristol. But on his whereabouts becoming known some of the citizens formed a plot for his liberation, whereupon he was secretly conducted by night to Berkeley. Murimuth (pp. 53–5) gives a rather different account of his wanderings, but brings him ultimately to Berkeley. The new gaolers now inflicted every possible indignity upon Edward, and entered on a systematic course of ill-treatment which could have but one end. He was denied sufficient food and clothing, he was prevented from sleeping, he was crowned with a crown of hay, and shaved by the roadside with ditch water. Yet the queen reproved the guards for their mild treatment. At last Thomas of Berkeley was removed from his own castle, so that the inhumanity of the gaolers should be deprived of its last restraint. Edward was now removed to a pestilential chamber over a charnel-house in the hope that he would die of disease; but as his robust constitution still prevailed, he was barbarously murdered in his bed on 21 Sept. His dying shrieks, resounding throughout the castle, sufficiently attested the horror of his end. It was given out that he had died a natural death, and his body was exposed to view as evidence of his end ('Documents relating to the Death and Burial of Edward II,' by S. A. Moore, in *Archæologia*, l. 215–226). At last it was buried with considerable pomp in the abbey of St. Peter at Gloucester, now the cathedral (*ib.*) In after years his son erected a tomb over his remains, which is one of the glories of mediæval sculpture and decorative tabernacle work (*Archæol. Journ.* xvii. 297–310). His misfortunes had so far caused his errors to be forgotten, that it was much debated by the people whether, like Thomas of Lancaster, he had not merited the honour of sanctity (KNIGHTON, c. 2551). The Welsh, among whom he was always popular, kept green the memory of his fate by mournful dirges in their native tongue (WALSINGHAM, i. 83).

Edward's death was so mysterious that rumours were soon spread by the foes of the government that he was still alive. For believing such rumours Edmund of Kent incurred the penalties of treason in 1328. In

the next generation a circumstantial story was repeated that Edward had escaped from Berkeley, and after long wanderings in Ireland, England, the Low Countries, and France, ended his life in a hermit's cell in Lombardy (letter of Manuel Fieschi to Edward III from Cartulary of Maguelone in No. 37 of the *Publications de la Société Archéologique de Montpellier* (1878); cf. article of Mr. Bent in *Macmillan's Magazine*, xli. 393–4, *Notes and Queries*, 6th series, ii. 381, 401, 489, and Stubbs, *Chron. Edw. I and II*, ii. ciii–cviii).

Edward's family by his wife consisted of (1) Edward of Windsor, born at Windsor on 13 Nov. 1312, who succeeded him [see Edward III]; (2) John of Eltham, born at Eltham; (3) Eleanor, also called Isabella (*Ann. Paul.* p. 283), born at Woodstock on 8 June 1318, and married in 1332 to Reginald, count of Guelderland; (4) Joan of the Tower, born in that fortress in July 1321, married in 1328 to David, son of Robert Bruce, and afterwards king of Scots; she was dead in 1357 (Sandford, *Genealogical History*, pp. 145–56).

[Some of the best authorities for Edward II's life and reign are collected by Dr. Stubbs in his Chronicles of the Reigns of Edward I and Edward II in the Rolls Series, with very valuable prefaces. They include the short and incomplete biography by Sir T. de la Moor, and also the Annales Paulini, Annales Londinienses, and the Lives by the Monk of Malmesbury and canon of Bridlington. Other chroniclers are A. Murimuth and W. of Hemingburgh (Engl. Hist. Soc.), the continuator of Trivet (ed. Hall), 1722, the Annals of Lanercost and Scalachronica (Bannatyne Club), Henry of Knighton in Twysden's Decem Scriptores, Higden's Polychronicon, Trokelowe (Rolls Ser.), Blaneford (Rolls Ser.), Walsingham (Rolls Ser.) The chief published original documents are those collected in Rymer's Fœdera, vol. ii. Record edition, Parliamentary Writs, vol. ii. and the Rolls of Parliament, vol. i. The Rev. C. H. Hartshorne has published an itinerary of Edward II in Collectanea Archæologica, i. 113–44, British Arch. Association. The best modern accounts of the reign are in Stubbs's Const. Hist. vol. ii. and Pauli's Geschichte von England, vol. iv.] T. F. T.

EDWARD III (1312–1377), king, eldest son of Edward II and Isabella, daughter of Philip IV of France, was born at Windsor Castle on 13 Nov. 1312, and was baptised on the 16th. His uncle, Prince Lewis of France, and other Frenchmen at the court wished that he should be named Lewis, but the English lords would not allow it. The king, who is said to have been consoled by his birth for the loss of Gaveston (Trokelowe, p. 79), gave him the counties of Chester and Flint, and he was summoned to parliament as Earl of Chester in 1320. He never bore the title of Prince of Wales. His tutor was Richard de Bury [q. v.], afterwards bishop of Durham. In order to avoid doing homage to Charles IV of France the king transferred the county of Ponthieu to him on 2 Sept. 1325, and the duchy of Aquitaine on the 10th (*Fœdera*, ii. 607, 608). He sailed from Dover on the 12th, joined his mother in France, and did homage to his uncle for his French fiefs (*Cont.* Will. of Nangis, ii. 60). He accompanied his mother to Hainault, and visited the court of Count William at Valenciennes in the summer of 1326 (Froissart, i. 23, 233). Isabella entered into an agreement on 27 Aug. to forward the marriage of her son to Philippa, the count's daughter (Froissart, ed. Luce, Pref. cl). Edward landed with his mother and the force of Hainaulters and others that she had engaged to help her on 27 Sept. at Colvasse, near Harwich, and accompanied her on her march towards London by Bury St. Edmunds, Cambridge, and Dunstable. Then, hearing that the king had left London, the queen turned westwards, and at Oxford Edward heard Bishop Orlton preach his treasonable sermon [see under Adam of Orlton]. From Oxford he was taken to Wallingford and Gloucester, where the queen's army was joined by many lords. Thence the queen marched to Berkeley, and on 26 Oct. to Bristol. The town was surrendered to her, and the next day Hugh Despenser the elder [q. v.] was put to death, and Edward was proclaimed guardian of the kingdom in the name of his father and during his absence (*Fœdera*, ii. 646). On the 28th he issued writs for a parliament in the king's name. When the parliament met at Westminster on 7 Jan. 1327 the king was a prisoner, and an oath was taken by the prelates and lords to uphold the cause of the queen and her son. On the 13th Orlton demanded whether they would have the king or his son to reign over them. The next day Edward was chosen, and was presented to the people in Westminster Hall (W. Dene, *Anglia Sacra*, i. 367; for fuller accounts of this revolution see Stubbs, *Chron. of Edwards I and II*, vol. ii. Introd., and *Const. Hist.* ii. 358 sq.) As Edward declared that he would not accept the crown without his father's consent, the king was forced to agree to his own deposition.

The new king's peace was proclaimed on 24 Jan.; he was knighted by his cousin Henry, earl of Lancaster, and was crowned on Sunday, the 29th (*Fœdera*, ii. 684). He met his parliament on 3 Feb.; a council was appointed for him, and the chief member of it was Lancaster, who was the young king's nominal

guardian. All real power, however, was in the hands of the queen and Mortimer, and for the next four years Edward was entirely governed by them (Avesbury, p. 7). Isabella obtained so enormous a settlement that the king was left with only a third of the revenues of the crown (Murimuth, p. 53). Peace was made with France on 31 March; both kings were to restore whatever had been seized during time of peace, and Edward bound himself to pay fifty thousand marks to the French king (*Fœdera*, ii. 700). Although negotiations were on foot for a permanent peace with Scotland, both countries prepared for war, and on 5 April the king ordered all who owed him service to meet at Newcastle on 29 May (*ib.* 702). He marched with his mother to York, where he was joined by Sir John of Hainault and a body of Flemish. While he was holding a feast on Trinity Sunday a fierce quarrel broke out between the Hainaulters and the English archers, in which many were slain on both sides (Jehan le Bel, i. 39; Froissart, i. 45). The truce was actually broken by the Scots, who invaded the northern counties under Randolph, earl of Moray, and Douglas. Edward marched from York to Durham without gaining any tidings of the enemy, though he everywhere beheld signs of the devastation they had wrought. He crossed the Tyne, hoping to intercept the Scots on their return. After remaining a week on the left bank of the river without finding the enemy, he ordered his troops, who had suffered much from constant rain, to recross the river. At last an esquire named Thomas Rokesby brought him news of the enemy and led the army to the place where they were encamped, a service for which the king knighted him and gave him 100*l.* a year (*Fœdera*, ii. 717). The Scots, twenty-four thousand in number, occupied so strong a position on the right bank of the Wear that Edward, though at the head of sixty-two thousand men, did not dare to cross the river and attack them. It was therefore decided, as they seemed to be cut off from returning to their country, to starve them into leaving their position and giving battle. Early in the morning of the fourth day it was discovered that they had decamped. Edward followed them and found them even more strongly posted than before at Stanhope Park. Again the English encamped in front of them, and the first night after Edward's arrival Douglas, at the head of a small party, surprised the camp, penetrated to the king's tent, cut some of the cords, and led his men back with little loss (Bridlington, p. 96; Jehan le Bel, i. 67; Froissart, i. 68, 279). After the two armies had faced each other for fifteen days or more the Scots again decamped by night, and Edward gave up all hope of cutting off their retreat or forcing them to fight. His army was unable to move with the same rapidity as the Scots, who were unencumbered with baggage; he was altogether outmanœuvred, and led his troops back to York, much chagrined with the ill success of his first military enterprise. He had to pay 14,000*l.* to Sir John of Hainault for his help (*Fœdera*, ii. 708); he raised money from the Bardi, Florentine bankers (*ib.* 712), received a twentieth from the parliament that met at Lincoln on 15 Sept., and a tenth from the clergy of Canterbury (Knighton, c. 2552). The king's father was put to death on 21 Sept. On 15 Aug. Edward wrote from York to John XXII for a dispensation for his marriage with Philippa of Hainault, for his mother and the Countess of Hainault were both grandchildren of Philip III of France (*Fœdera*, ii. 712). The dispensation was granted; Philippa arrived in London on 24 Dec., and the marriage was performed at York on 24 Jan. 1328 by William Melton, archbishop of York, the king being then little more than fifteen, and his bride still younger. At the parliament held at York on 1 March peace was made with Scotland, and the treaty was confirmed in the parliament which met at Northampton on 24 April. By this treaty Edward gave up all claims over the Scottish kingdom; a marriage was arranged between his sister Joan and David, the heir of King Robert; a perpetual alliance was made between the two kingdoms, saving the alliance between Scotland and France, and the Scottish king bound himself to pay Edward 20,000*l.* (4 May, *ib.* pp. 734, 740). The treaty was held to be the work of Isabella and Mortimer, and was generally condemned in England as shameful (Avesbury, p. 7; Walsingham, i. 192). Isabella seems to have got hold of a large part of the money paid by the Scottish king (*Fœdera*, ii. 770, 785). Edward now sent two representatives to Paris to state his claim to the French throne, vacant by the death of Charles IV. He claimed as the heir of Philip IV, through his mother, Isabella. By the so-called Salic law Isabella and her heirs were barred from the succession, and even supposing that, though females were barred, they had nevertheless been held capable of transmitting a right to the throne, Charles of Evreux, the son of Jeanne of Navarre, daughter of Philip IV, would have had at least as good a claim as Edward. The throne was adjudged to Philip of Valois, son of a younger brother of Philip IV. The insolence and rapacity of the queen-mother and Mortimer gave deep offence to the nobles, and the

nation generally was scandalised at the connection that was said to exist between them and enraged at the dishonourable peace with Scotland. Lancaster, the head of the party which held to the policy of the 'ordainers' of the last reign, and the chief lord of the council, was denied access to the king, and found himself virtually powerless. He determined to make a stand against the tyranny of the favourite, and, hearing that Mortimer had come up to the parliament at Salisbury on 24 Oct. with an armed retinue, declared that he would not attend, and remained at Winchester under arms with some of his party. His action was upheld by the king's uncles, the Earls of Kent and Norfolk, by Stratford, bishop of Winchester, and others. Edward was forced to adjourn the parliament till the following February, and Mortimer wished him to march at once to Winchester against the earl. Shortly afterwards the king rode with Mortimer and the queen to ravage the earl's lands (W. Dene, *Anglia Sacra*, i. 369; Knighton, c. 2557). Lancaster made a confederation against the favourite at London on 2 Jan. 1329 (Barnes, p. 31), and marched with a considerable force to Bedford in the hope of meeting him. Meanwhile his town of Leicester was surrendered to Mortimer and the queen, and before long Kent and Norfolk withdrew from him. Peace was made between the two parties by Mepeham, archbishop of Canterbury, and Lord Beaumont and some other followers of the earl were forced to take shelter in France.

Early in February messengers came from Philip VI of France to Edward at Windsor, bidding him come and do homage for his French fiefs. He had received a like summons the year before, and now he laid the matter before the magnates assembled in parliament at Westminster. When they decided that he should obey the summons he appointed a proctor to declare that his homage did not prejudice his claim to the French crown. On 26 May he sailed from Dover, leaving his brother John, earl of Cornwall, as guardian of the kingdom (*Fœdera*, ii. 763, 764). He landed at Whitsand, and thence went to Boulogne, and so to Montreuil, where Philip's messengers met him and conducted him to Amiens. There Philip awaited him with the kings of Bohemia, Navarre, and Majorca, and many princes and lords whom he had invited to witness the ceremony. The homage was done in the choir of Amiens Cathedral on 6 June, but the ceremony could scarcely have pleased Philip, for Edward appeared in a robe of crimson velvet worked with leopards in gold and wearing his crown, sword, and spurs. Philip demanded liege homage, which was done bareheaded and with ungirt sword. Edward refused this, and he was forced to accept general homage on Edward's promise that on his return he would search the records of his kingdom, and if liege homage was due would send over an acknowledgment by letters patent. Then Edward demanded restitution of certain lands that had been taken from his father. To this Philip answered that they had been taken in war (meaning that they did not come under the terms of the treaty of 1327), and that if Edward had any cause of complaint he should bring it before the parliament of Paris (*ib.* p. 765; *Cont.* Will. of Nangis, ii. 107). Edward returned to England on the 11th, well pleased with his visit and the honour that had been done him, and at once proposed marriages between his sister Eleanor and Philip's eldest son, and between his brother John and a daughter of Philip (*ib.* pp. 766, 777); but these proposals came to naught. Meanwhile Mortimer and Isabella had not forgiven the attempt that had been made against them, and Mortimer is said to have contrived a scheme which enabled him to accuse the Earl of Kent of treason [for particulars see under Edmund of Woodstock]. The earl was tried by his peers, unjustly condemned, and put to death on 19 March 1330, Isabella and Mortimer hastening on his execution for fear that the king might interfere to prevent it, and, as it seems, giving the order for it without the king's knowledge (Knighton, c. 2557; Barnes, p. 41). On 4 March Queen Philippa was crowned, and on 15 June she bore Edward his first-born child, Edward, afterwards called the Black Prince [q. v.] The birth of his son seems to have determined Edward to free himself from the thraldom in which he was kept by his mother and her favourite. When parliament met at Nottingham in October, Isabella and Mortimer took up their abode in the castle, which was closely kept. The king consulted with some of his friends, and especially with William Montacute, how they might seize Mortimer. They, and the king with them, entered the castle by night through an underground passage and seized Mortimer and some of his party. He was taken to London, condemned without trial by his peers as notoriously guilty of several treasonable acts, and particularly of the death of the late king, and hanged on 29 Nov. By the king's command the lords passed sentence on Sir Simon Bereford, one of Mortimer's abettors, though they were not his peers, and he also was hanged. A pension was allotted to the queen-mother, and she was kept until her death in a kind of honourable confinement at Castle Rising

in Norfolk, where the king visited her every year.

The overthrow of Mortimer made Edward at the age of eighteen a king in fact as well as in name. In person he was graceful, and his face was 'as the face of a god' (*Cont.* Murimuth, p. 226). His manners were courtly and his voice winning. He was strong and active, and loved hunting, hawking, the practice of knightly exercises, and, above all, war itself. Considerable care must have been spent on his education, for he certainly spoke English as well as French (Froissart, i. 266 sq., 306, 324, 360, iv. 290, 326), and evidently understood German. He was fearless in battle, and, though over-fond of pleasure, was until his later years energetic in all his undertakings. Although according to modern notions his ambition is to be reckoned a grave defect in his character, it seemed in his day a kingly quality. Nor were his wars undertaken without cause, or indeed, according to the ideas of the time, without ample justification. His attempts to bring Scotland under his power were at first merely a continuation of an inherited policy that it would have been held shameful to repudiate, and later were forced upon him by the alliance between that country and France. And the French war was in the first instance provoked by the aggressions of Philip, though Edward's assumption of the title of king of France, a measure of political expediency, rendered peace impossible. He was liberal in his gifts, magnificent in his doings, profuse in his expenditure, and, though not boastful, inordinately ostentatious. No sense of duty beyond what was then held to become a knight influenced his conduct. While he was not wantonly cruel he was hard-hearted; his private life was immoral, and his old age was dishonoured by indulgence in a shameful passion. As a king he had no settled principles of constitutional policy. Regarding his kingship mainly as the means of raising the money he needed for his wars and his pleasures, he neither strove to preserve prerogatives as the just rights of the crown, nor yielded anything out of consideration for the rights or welfare of his subjects. Although the early glories of his reign were greeted with applause, he never won the love of his people; they groaned under the effects of his extravagance, and fled at his coming lest his officers should seize their goods. His commercial policy was enlightened, and has won him the title of the 'father of English commerce' (Hallam, *Const. Hist.* iii. 321), but it was mainly inspired by selfish motives, and he never scrupled to sacrifice the interests of the English merchants to obtain a supply of money or secure an ally. In foreign politics he showed genius; his alliances were well devised and skilfully obtained, but he seems to have expected more from his allies than they were likely to do for him, for England still stood so far apart from continental affairs that her alliance was not of much practical importance, except commercially. As a leader in war Edward could order a battle and inspire his army with his own confidence, but he could not plan a campaign; he was rash, and left too much to chance. During the first part of his reign he paid much attention to naval administration; he successfully asserted the maritime supremacy of the country, and was entitled by parliament the 'king of the sea' (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 311); he neglected the navy in his later years. Little as the nation owed him in other respects, his achievements by sea and land made the English name respected. Apart from the story of these acts the chief interest of the reign is foreign to the purpose of a biographical sketch; it consists in the transition that it witnessed from mediæval to modern systems and ideas (Stubbs, *Const. Hist.* ii. 375, which should be consulted for an estimate of Edward's character). Parliament adopted its present division into two houses, and in various points gradually gained on the prerogative. In church matters, papal usurpations were met by direct and decisive legislation, an anti-clerical party appeared, the wealth of the church was attacked, and a protest was made against clerical administration. As regards jurisdiction, the reign saw a separation between the judicial work of the council and of the chancellor, who now began to act as an independent judge of equity. Chivalry, already decaying, and feudalism, already long decayed, received a deathblow from the use of gunpowder. Other and wider social changes followed the 'great pestilence'—an increase in the importance of capital in trade and the rise of journeymen as a distinct class, the rapid overthrow of villenage, and the appearance of tenant-farmers and paid farm labourers as distinct classes. These and many more changes, which cannot be discussed in a narrative of the king's life, mark the reign as a period in which old things were passing away and the England of our own day began to be formed.

In spite of the treaty of 1327 matters remained unsettled between the kings of England and France; Philip delayed the promised restitutions and disturbed Edward's possessions in Aquitaine. Saintes was taken by the Duke of Alençon in 1329, and Edward in consequence applied to parliament for a

subsidy in case of war. On 1 May 1330 negotiations were concluded at Bois-de-Vincennes, but the question of the nature of the homage was left unsettled by Edward (*Fœdera*, ii. 791), who was summoned to do liege homage on 29 July and did not attend (*ib.* p. 797). When, however, he became his own master, he adopted a wiser policy, and on 31 March 1331 acknowledged that he held the duchy of Guyenne and the county of Ponthieu by liege homage as a peer of France (*ib.* p. 813). On Mortimer's downfall he appointed two of the Lancastrian party as his chief ministers, Archbishop Melton as treasurer, and Stratford as chancellor. He now crossed to France with Stratford and a few companions disguised as merchants, pretending, as he caused to be proclaimed in London, that he was about to perform a vow (*ib.* p. 815), for he feared that his people would believe, as in fact they did, that he was gone to do liege homage (Hemingburgh, ii. 303). He embarked on 4 April. While he was in France Philip accepted his acknowledgment as to the homage, and promised to restore Saintes and to pay damages (*ib.* p. 816). Edward returned on the 20th, and celebrated his return by tournaments at Dartford in Kent and in Cheapside (Avesbury, p. 10). The restitution of Agenois, however, remained unsettled, and in the parliament of 30 Sept. the chancellor asked the estates whether the matter should be settled by war or negotiation, and they declared for negotiation (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 61). The king was advised to visit Ireland, where the royal interest had begun to decline, but the matter was deferred. Lawlessness had broken out in the northern counties, and he had to take active measures against some outlaws who had seized and put to ransom his chief justice, Sir Richard Willoughby, near Grantham (Knighton, c. 2559). Early in 1332 he invited Flemish weavers to settle in England in order to teach the manufacture of fine cloth; for the prosperity of the kingdom largely depended on its wool, and the crown drew much revenue from the trade in it. The foreign workmen were at first regarded with much dislike, but the king protected them, and they greatly improved the woollen manufacture. Edward received an invitation from Philip to join him in a crusade, and though willing to agree put the matter off for three years at the request of the parliament which met 16 March. On 25 June he laid a tallage on his demesne. In order to avoid this unconstitutional measure the parliament of 9 Sept. granted him a subsidy, and in return he recalled his order and promised not to levy tallage save as his ancestors had done and according to his right (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 66). Meanwhile Lord Beaumont brought Edward Baliol [q. v.] to England, and Baliol offered to do the king homage if he would place him on the Scottish throne. Edward refused, and even ordered that he and his party should be prevented from crossing the marches, declaring that he would respect the treaty of Northampton (*Fœdera*, ii. 843), for he was bound to pay 20,000*l.* to the pope if he broke it. Nevertheless he dealt subtly. Baliol was crowned on 24 Sept. in opposition to the young king David II, and on 23 Nov. declared at Roxburgh that he owed his crown to the help given him by Edward's subjects and allowed by Edward, and that he was his liegeman, and promised him the town of Berwick, and offered to marry his sister Joan, David's queen (*ib.* p. 847). Edward summoned a parliament to meet at York on 4 Dec. to advise him what policy he should pursue; few attended, and it was adjourned to 20 Jan. Meanwhile Baliol lost his kingdom and fled into England.

The parliament advised Edward to write to the pope and the French king, declaring that the Scots had broken the treaty. This they seem actually to have done on 21 March by a raid on Gilsland in Cumberland (Hemingburgh, ii. 307). The raid was revenged; Sir William Douglas was taken, and Edward, who was then at Pontefract waiting for his army to assemble, ordered that he should be kept in fetters (*Fœdera*, ii. 856). On 23 April Edward laid siege to Berwick. The garrison promised to surrender if not relieved by a certain day, and gave hostages. Sir Archibald Douglas attempted to relieve the town, and some of his men entered it; he then led his force to plunder Northumberland. The garrison refused to surrender on the ground that they had received succour, and Edward hanged one of the hostages, the son of Sir Thomas Seton, before the town (Bridlington, p. 113; Fordun, iv. 1022; Hailes, iii. 96 sq.) Douglas now recrossed the Tweed, came to the relief of Berwick, and encamped at Dunsepark on 18 July. Edward occupied Halidon Hill, to the west of the town. His army was in great danger, and was hemmed in by the sea, the Tweed, the garrison of Berwick, and the Scottish host, which far outnumbered the English (Hemingburgh, ii. 309). On the 20th he drew up his men in four battles, placing his archers on the wings of each; all fought on foot, and he himself in the van. The English archers began the fight; the Scots fell in great numbers, and others fled; the rest charged up the hill and engaged the enemy

hand to hand. They were defeated with tremendous loss; many nobles were slain, and it was commonly said in England that the war was over, for that there was not a Scot left to raise a force or lead it to battle (MURIMUTH, p. 71). Edward ordered a general thanksgiving for this victory (*Fœdera*, ii. 866). Berwick was at once surrendered, and he offered privileges to English merchants and others who would colonise it. He received the homage of the Earl of March and other lords, and, having restored Baliol to the throne, returned southwards and visited several shrines, especially in Essex. In November he moved northwards, and kept Christmas at York. He was highly displeased with the pope for appointing Adam of Orlton by provision to the see of Winchester at the request of the French king. In February 1334 he received Baliol's surrender of all Scotland comprised in the ancient district of Lothian. On the 21st he held a parliament at York, and agreed that purveyance, a prerogative that pressed sorely on the people, should only be made on behalf of the king (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 378). He kept Whitsuntide at Newcastle, and there on 12 June Baliol renewed his concessions and did homage (*Fœdera*, ii. 888). Edward, after appointing officers to administer the government in Lothian, returned to Windsor. On 10 July he held a council at Nottingham, where he again spoke of the proposed crusade, for he believed that matters were now settled with Scotland. A parliament was summoned, and when it met on 24 Sept. Baliol had again been expelled. The king obtained a grant, and about 1 Nov. marched into Scotland. Just before he started Robert of Artois, who had a bitter quarrel with King Philip, sought refuge at his court; he received him with honour, and Robert never ceased to stir him up against the French king. Edward passed through Lothian without meeting opposition, again restored Baliol, and spent Christmas at Roxburgh. At mid-Lent 1335 he gave audience at Gedling, near Nottingham, to ambassadors from Philip sent to urge him to make peace with Scotland; he refused, but granted a truce (*ib.* ii. 903). In July he entered Scotland by Carlisle, marched to Glasgow, was joined by Baliol, proceeded to Perth, ravaged the north, and returned to Perth, where on 18 Aug. he received the submission of the Earl of Atholl, whom he left governor under Baliol. Both Philip and Benedict XII, who was wholly under Philip's control, were now pressing him to make peace. The Scots were helped by money from France, and their ships were fitted out in French ports (*ib.* p. 911); an invasion was expected in August, and captains were appointed to command the Londoners in case it took place (*ib.* p. 917). The king's son, the young Earl of Chester, was sent to Nottingham Castle for safety, and the Isle of Wight and the Channel islands were fortified (*ib.* p. 919). Edward's seneschals in Aquitaine were also aggrieved by the French king. On 23 Nov. Edward made a truce with his enemies in Scotland, which was prolonged at the request of the pope (*ib.* pp. 926, 928). He spent Christmas at Newcastle. The party of Bruce, however, gained strength, Atholl was surprised and slain, and before the end of the year Baliol's cause was again depressed. Edward, who had returned to the south in February, on 7 April appointed Henry of Lancaster to command an army against the Scots (*ib.* p. 936), and in June entered Scotland himself with a large force, marched to Perth, and then by Dunkeld, through Atholl and Moray to Elgin and Inverness, ravaging as he went. The regent, Sir Andrew Murray, refused to give him battle, and, leaving a garrison in Perth and a fleet in the Forth, he returned to England. Meanwhile Philip expelled Edward's seneschals from Agenois, and in August openly declared that he should help the Scots (*ib.* p. 944). On the 16th Edward, hearing that ships were being fitted out in Norman and Breton ports to act against England, bade his admirals put to sea, reminding them that his 'progenitors, kings of England, had been lords of the English sea on every side,' and that he would not allow his honour to be diminished (NICOLAS, *Royal Navy*, ii. 17). Some of these ships attacked certain English ships off the Isle of Wight and carried off prizes. War with France now seemed certain, and the parliament that met at Nottingham on 6 Sept. granted the king a tenth and a fifteenth, besides the subsidy of the same amount granted in March, together with 40*s.* a sack on wool exported by denizens and 60*s.* from aliens. A body of merchants was specially summoned by the king to this parliament, probably in order to obtain their consent to the custom on wool (*Const. Hist.* ii. 379). Moreover, Edward seized all the money laid up in the cathedral churches for the crusade. In March 1337 the exportation of wool was forbidden by statute until the king and council should determine what should be done. A heavy custom was laid on the sack and woolfells by ordinance, an unconstitutional act, though to some extent sanctioned by parliament (*ib.* p. 526). The importation of cloth was also forbidden by statute, but foreign workmen were encouraged to settle here.

Edward now set about forming alliances in order to hem Philip in on the north and east, and sent Montacute, whom he created

Earl of Salisbury, and others to make alliance with foreign powers, giving them authority, in spite of the interests of the English merchants, to make arrangements about the wool trade (*ib.* p. 966; LONGMAN, i. 108). Lewis, count of Flanders, was inclined to the French alliance, but his people knew their own interest better, for their wealth depended on English wool, and the year before, when the count had arrested English merchants, the king had seized all their merchants and ships (*Fœdera*, ii. 948). James van Artevelde, a rich and highly connected citizen of Ghent, and the leader of the Flemish traders who were opposed to the count, entered into negotiations with Edward and procured him the alliance of Ghent, Bruges, Ypres, and Cassel (JEHAN LE BEL, p. 1327; FROISSART, i. 394). Edward also gained the Duke of Brabant as an ally by permitting staples for wool to be set up in Brussels, Mechlin, and Louvain (*Fœdera*, p. 959), and made treaties for supplies of troops with his brothers-in-law the Count of Gueldres and the margrave of Juliers, and his father-in-law the Count of Hainault (*ib.* p. 970). Further, he negotiated with the Count Palatine about his appointment as imperial vicar, and on 26 Aug. made a treaty for the hire of troops with the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria (*ib.* p. 991). This highly displeased Benedict XII, who was at deadly feud with Lewis, and was besides quite in the hands of Philip, and he remonstrated with Edward, who replied courteously but without giving way. Edward tried hard to gain the Count of Flanders, and proposed a marriage between the count's son and his little daughter Joan (*ib.* pp. 967, 998), though at the same time he offered her to Otto, duke of Austria, for his son (*ib.* p. 1001). In March the French burnt Portsmouth and ravaged Guernsey and Jersey (*ib.* p. 989; NICOLAS). The king made great preparations for war; on 1 July he took all the property of the alien priories into his own hands; pawned his jewels, and in order to interest his people in his cause issued a schedule of the offers of peace he had made to Philip, which he ordered should be read in all county courts (*Fœdera*, p. 994). On 7 Oct. he wrote letters to his allies, styling himself 'king of France' (*ib.* p. 1001). Count Lewis, who was now expelled from Flanders by his subjects, kept a garrison at Cadsand under his brother Sir Guy, the bastard of Flanders, which tried to intercept the king's ambassadors and did harm to his allies the Flemings. Edward declared he 'would soon settle that business,' and sent a fleet under Sir Walter Manny and Henry of Lancaster, earl of Derby, against it. They gained a complete victory on 10 Nov., and brought back Sir Guy prisoner. Then two cardinals came to England to make peace, and Edward promised that he would not invade France until 1 March 1338, and afterwards extended the term (*ib.* pp. 1009, 1014).

Philip, however, continued his aggressions on the king's French dominions, and war became imminent. In February parliament granted the king half the wool of the kingdom, twenty thousand sacks, to be delivered at Antwerp, where he hoped to sell it well, and on 16 July he sailed from Orwell in Suffolk with two hundred large ships for Antwerp, for he intended to invade France from that side in company with his allies. He found that they were by no means ready to act with him, the princes who held of the emperor being unwilling to act without his direct sanction, and he remained for some time in enforced inactivity, spending large sums on the pay of his army, and keeping much state at the monastery of St. Bernard at Antwerp. Meanwhile some French and Spanish galleys sacked Southampton and captured some English ships, and among them the 'cog' Christopher, the largest of the king's vessels (*Cont.* WILL. OF NANGIS; MINOT, *Political Songs*, i. 64 sq.) At last on 5 Sept. a meeting took place between Edward and the emperor at Coblentz. The interview was held in the market-place with much magnificence (KNIGHTON, c. 2571; FROISSART, i. 425). Lewis appointed Edward imperial vicar, and expected him to kiss his foot, which he refused to do on the ground that he was 'an anointed king' (WALSINGHAM, i. 223). Edward now held courts at Arques and other places, heard causes as the emperor's representative, and received homages. Still his allies did not move, though they agreed to recover Cambray for the empire in the following summer. Influenced probably by the pope's remonstrances (*ib.* i. 208 seq.), Edward in October sent ambassadors to treat with Philip, and though he at first forbade them to address Philip as king, he afterwards allowed them to do so, probably at Benedict's request (*Fœdera*, ii. 1066, 1068). Nothing came of their mission. In 1339 he was in want of money, pawned his crowns, and borrowed fifty-four thousand florins of three burghers of Mechlin (*ib.* pp. 1073, 1085). After many delays he and his allies laid siege to Cambray (cannon are said to have been used by the besieging army, NICOLAS, *Royal Navy*, i. 184; it is also said by BARBOUR, iii. 136, ed. Pinkerton, that 'crakys of war' had been used by Edward in Scotland in 1327; this, however, is highly doubtful, BRACKENBURY, *Ancient Cannon in Europe*, pt. i.) Finding Cambray difficult to take, the allies gave up

the siege, and in October Edward crossed the Scheldt into France. On coming to the river he was left by the Counts of Namur and Hainault, who held of the French crown. He pillaged Vermandois, and advanced to La Flamengrie. Here he was confronted by Philip, and sent a herald to demand battle. Philip appointed a day, and he drew up his army with much skill in a strong position, placing the horses and baggage in a wood at his rear, and commanding the van in person on foot (Avesbury, p. 45). When the appointed day came, Philip would not attack him, though the French army was much stronger than his, and knowing that he could put but little confidence in his allies he led them back to Hainault, parted from them, and returned to Brussels. After entering into a close alliance with the Duke of Brabant and the cities of Brabant and Flanders, he spent Christmas at Antwerp with much pomp. Van Artevelde now pointed out that if he wanted the help of the Flemings he must take the title of 'king of France,' which he had as yet only used incidentally, for he would then become their superior lord, and they would not incur a penalty which they had bound themselves to pay to the pope in case they made war on the king of France. This was insisted on by the Flemish cities and lords at a parliament at Brussels, and on 26 Jan. 1340 Edward assumed the title of king of France, and quartered the lilies of France with the leopards of England (Nicolas, *Chronology*, p. 318; Barnes, p. 155).

Meanwhile several attacks had been made on the English coast by French and Genoese ships; the war with Scotland still went on in a languid fashion, and the people, who saw no return for the sacrifices they had made for the French war, were getting tired of it. In the January parliament of this year the commons made their offer of supplies conditional on the acceptance of certain articles. This determined the king to return. His debts, however, now amounted to 30,000*l.*, and his creditors wanted some security before they let him go. He left his queen behind, and further left the Earls of Derby and Salisbury and others as pledges that he would shortly return (*Cont.* Will. of Nangis, ii. 167). He landed at Orwell on 21 Feb. and held a parliament in March, which granted him large supplies for two years, and among them the ninth sheaf, fleece, and lamb, and 40*s.* on the sack of wool, while on his side certain statutes were framed to meet the complaints of the commons—tallages were not to be levied by the king on his demesne; the assumption of the title of king of France was not to bring England into subjection to France; the crown was not to abuse its rights of purveyance, presentation to vacant benefices, and the like (*Const. Hist.* ii. 382; *Rot. Parl.* ii. 113). After raising all the money he could, Edward was about to embark again, and was at Ipswich at Whitsuntide, when the chancellor, Stratford, who had been translated to the see of Canterbury in 1333, and his admiral, Sir John Morley, told him that they had news that the French fleet was in the Sluys waiting to intercept him, and begged him not to sail. 'I will go,' he said, 'and you who are afraid without cause may stay at home' (Avesbury, p. 55). He sailed in the cog Thomas on the 22nd, with about two hundred vessels, and was joined by the northern squadron of about fifty sail under Morley. Next day off Blankenberg he saw the masts of the enemy's fleet in the Sluys, and sent knights to reconnoitre from the coast. As after their return the tide did not serve, Edward did not attack that day, and prepared for battle about 11 A.M. on the 24th. The French fleet of 190 galleys and great barges was superior to his in strength (Jehan le Bel, i. 171), for many of his ships were small. Nineteen of their ships were the biggest that had ever been seen, and grandest of all was the Christopher that had been taken from the English. Edward's fleet seems to have been 'to the leeward and westward' of the enemy, and about noon he ordered his ships to sail on the starboard tack, so as to get the wind, which presumably was north-east, and avoid having the sun in the faces of the archers. Then, having made their tack and got the wind, his ships entered the port and engaged just inside it. The French ships seem to have hugged the shore, and could not manœuvre, for they were lashed together in four lines. All in three of the lines were taken or sunk, the Christopher and other English ships being retaken; the fourth line escaped in the darkness, for the battle lasted into the night. The king's victory was complete, and the naval power of France was destroyed (Nicolas, *Royal Navy*, ii. 48 seq., 501, where references are given). Edward's campaign was futile. The last grant was not yet turned into money, and was already pledged, and the king wrote urgently for supplies (*Fœdera*, ii. 1130). On 23 July he and his allies besieged Tournay, and on the 26th he wrote a letter to 'Philip of Valois' inviting him to meet him in single combat or with a hundred men each, and so to end the war. Philip answered that the letter was not addressed to him, and that he would drive him out of France at his own will (*ib.* p. 1131). The siege lasted eleven weeks. No money came to Edward; Robert of Artois was

defeated at St. Omer; Philip had overrun a large part of Guyenne; and the Scots were gaining ground rapidly. On 25 Sept. a truce was made between England and France and Scotland, and the king dismissed his army. He was forced to leave the Earl of Derby in prison in Flanders for his debts (*ib.* p. 1143), and, after a stormy passage of three days, arrived unexpectedly at the Tower of London on the night of 30 Nov. (*ib.* p. 1141).

The next day Edward dismissed his chancellor, the Bishop of Chichester, brother of Archbishop Stratford, who had lately resigned the chancellorship, and his treasurer, and imprisoned several judges and others. This sudden move was caused by his irritation at not having received the supplies he needed, and by the influence of the archbishop's enemies, of whom some were opposed to clerical administration and others were jealous of him and belonged to a court party. The archbishop took refuge at Canterbury, and on 14 Dec. the king gave the great seal to Sir Robert Bourchier [q. v.], the first lay chancellor, and appointed a lay treasurer. He required Stratford to pay to the merchants of Louvain debts for which he had become surety on Edward's own behalf, declaring that otherwise he, the king, should have to go to prison, and summoned him to appear. Stratford replied by preaching irritating sermons and forbidding the clergy to pay the late grant. Edward on 12 Feb. 1341 put forth a letter or pamphlet, called the *libellus famosus*, against Stratford, accusing the archbishop of urging him to undertake the war, and of having occasioned his failure before Tournay by retarding supplies, and containing much vague and unworthy abuse. Stratford's answer was dignified, and his case was strong, for it is pretty evident that the king's dissatisfaction with him was partly caused by his desire for peace. The king made a weak rejoinder. He had incited the Duke of Brabant to summon Stratford to answer in his court for the bonds into which he had entered; he wrote to Benedict XII against him, cited him to answer charges in the exchequer court, tried to prevent his taking his seat in the parliament of 23 April, and caused articles of accusation to be laid before the commons. Stratford declared that he would only answer for his conduct before his peers. The lords reported that this was their privilege, and thus secured it for their order. The king was checked, and on 7 May was reconciled to the archbishop (Birchington, p. 20 seq.; Avesbury, p. 71; Hemingburgh, ii. 363 seq.; *Fœdera*, ii. 1143, 1147, 1152; *Const. Hist.* ii. 384; Collier, iii. 71). In return for help in collecting the grant of 1340 for this year, he conceded a statute providing that ministers should be appointed in parliament with the advice of his lords and counsellors, should be sworn in parliament, and should be liable to be called upon to answer for their actions. On 1 Oct., however, he issued letters annulling this statute and declaring openly that he had 'dissembled' in order to gain his purpose (*Fœdera*, ii. 177). No parliament was summoned for two years after this shameful breach of faith.

King David's cause was now prospering in Scotland, and in the autumn Edward marched northwards, intending to carry on the war on a large scale after Christmas (*ib.* ii. 1181). He is said to have relieved the castle of Wark, then besieged during a Scottish raid, and to have fallen in love with the Countess of Salisbury, who held it for her husband, then a captive in France, but she did not return his passion (Jehan le Bel, i. 266, Froissart, ii. 131, who both tell the story at considerable length). Jehan le Bel says that he afterwards violated the lady (ii. 131); Froissart indignantly denies this, but only in the late Amiens recension (iii. 293). Considerable doubt has been thrown upon the story because the countess was much older than the king, and because in May Edward made an agreement for the earl's release (*Fœdera*, ii. 1193). The friendship that existed between the king and the earl would give a peculiarly dark character to Edward's crime if it was committed. It is possible that Jehan le Bel may have been mistaken as to the countess, but scarcely possible that Edward did not commit the crime of which he is accused upon some lady or other. The fleet which he ordered to meet him was damaged by a gale; Stirling and Edinburgh were taken by the Scots, and he made a truce at Newcastle. After spending Christmas at Melrose he returned to England. In the course of 1341 Lewis of Bavaria, who had repented of his alliance with him soon after he had made it, revoked his appointment as imperial vicar and allied himself with France. Edward's attempts to penetrate into France through Flanders had only involved him in debt, and his Flemish and German allies had failed to give him efficient help. Now a new way of attack was opened to him, for in September John of Montfort came to him offering to hold Brittany of him if he would help him against Charles of Blois, to whom the duchy had been adjudged (*ib.* ii. 1176). On 20 March 1342 Edward sent a force over to Brittany under Sir Walter Manny, and in October he landed in person at Brest (Knighton, c. 2582), laid siege to Vannes, Rennes, and Nantes, without taking any of

them, and ravaged the country. The Duke of Normandy, Philip's son, advanced against him with a much larger force, but did not dare to attack him, for he posted his troops well. Still John kept the king shut in a corner near Vannes while the Genoese and Spanish fleets intercepted ships bringing provisions from England, and both armies suffered considerably. On 19 Jan. 1343 a truce for three years was made at Ste.-Madeleine, near Vannes, by the intervention of Pope Clement VI, and Edward re-embarked. After a tempestuous voyage, which is said to have lasted five weeks (*ib.* c. 2583), he landed at Weymouth on 2 March (*Fœdera*, ii. 1222). In the parliament of 28 April the commons petitioned, among other articles, that the merchants should not grant the tax of 40*s.* on the sack of wool without their consent, and that statutes might not be annulled, as after the last parliament held in 1341. In conjunction with the lords they also petitioned against the papal usurpation of appointing to benefices by provision. On 10 Sept. the king wrote to the pope against reservations and provisions, complaining that by their means the revenues of the church were given to foreigners, that the rights of patrons were defeated, and that the authority of the royal courts was diminished (Walsingham, i. 255). Moreover on 30 Jan. 1344 he ordered that all persons bringing bulls of provision into the kingdom should be arrested (*Fœdera*, iii. 2). In this month the king held a 'Round Table,' or tournament and feast, at Windsor with extraordinary magnificence, and vowed at the altar of the castle chapel that he would restore the 'Round Table' of Arthur. With this intention he built the round tower of the castle, and he afterwards fulfilled his vow by instituting the order of the Garter (Murimuth, p. 154; Walsingham, i. 263; *Fœdera*, iii. 6). Great preparations were made for renewing the war; for messengers came to him from Gascony representing the rapid increase of the French power there, and he was further moved by the news of the fate of the Breton lords who were put to death in Paris. Nevertheless on 6 Aug. he gave authority to ambassadors to treat for peace before Clement, as a private person, not as pope (*Fœdera*, iii. 18, 19). In April 1345 he appointed Derby to command in Gascony; on 20 May he received at Lambeth the homage of John of Montfort, and on the 26th wrote to the pope that Philip had notoriously broken truce in Brittany, Gascony, and elsewhere, and that he declared war upon him (*ib.* pp. 36–41). Having sent the Earl of Northampton with a force to Brittany, he embarked at Sandwich with the Prince of Wales on 3 July (*ib.* p. 50), and crossed to Sluys; for affairs in Flanders threatened the loss of the Flemish alliance. A scheme was arranged between him and Van Artevelde for persuading the people of Flanders to accept the prince as their lord. Van Artevelde, however, was murdered at Ghent, and Edward returned home on the 26th. In this year the Bardi of Florence, the most powerful bankers in Italy, failed, chiefly through Edward's debts to them, for he owed them nine hundred thousand gold florins; the Peruzzi, to whom he owed six hundred thousand florins, also failed, and the stoppage of these two houses ruined many smaller ones, so that the king's default brought widespread misery on Florence (Gio. Villani, xii. c. 54).

In the summer of 1346 Edward intended to lead an army to help Derby in Guyenne, but shortly before he set out he was persuaded by Sir Geoffrey Harcourt, who had entered his service, to strike at the north of France, which was then unprepared to meet attack, for the Duke of Normandy and his army were engaged in the south (on the mistake of Froissart and Avesbury about this see Nicolas, *Royal Navy*, ii. 88). He sailed on 11 July from the Isle of Wight (*Fœdera*, iii. 85; not the 7th as *Cont.* Murimuth, p. 175), with, it is said, one thousand ships, four thousand men-at-arms, ten thousand bowmen, and a considerable force of Welsh and Irish badly armed foot-soldiers, and landed the next day at La Hogue (Avesbury, p. 123); the French vessels in the harbour were taken, the larger part of his fleet was dismissed, and the rest sent to ravage the coast. The army marched in three columns, the king commanding the centre; the wings diverged during the day, so that each ravaged a different tract, and united with the centre at night. Barfleur was taken on the 14th, and Valonges on the 18th, then Carentan and St. Lo, where the army was refreshed by finding a thousand tuns of wine, and on the 26th Edward came to Caen. He took the town easily by assault the next day, and sacked it thoroughly. Here he is said to have found a paper containing a plan for a second Norman conquest of England in 1337; this he sent home to be read in all churches (*ib.* p. 130); it is not unlikely that it was a forgery designed to rouse the popular spirit. At Caen he dismissed the remainder of the fleet, which had done much harm to the French shipping along the Norman coast. In spite of a remark attributed by Froissart (iii. 145) to Harcourt, that Edward intended to march to Calais, his only idea as yet was to do as much mischief as he could in northern France, and then retire into Flanders

before Philip could raise an army to intercept him. Had he intended to besiege Calais, he would not have dismissed his ships. He left Caen on the 31st, and on 2 Aug. arrived at Lisieux, where he was met by two cardinals with offers of peace, which he rejected. He then marched towards Rouen, but finding the bridge broken down, and the French in some force there, he turned up the left bank of the Seine, ravaging the country as he went. Everywhere he found the bridges broken, and as by this time a French force had gathered and followed his march on the opposite side of the river, he had no time to repair them. On the 13th he arrived at Poissy, and by detaching a body of troops to threaten Paris, which was only about twelve miles distant, he gained time to repair the bridge there, and on the 16th crossed the river. He now struck northwards, and marched through the Beauvoisin, while Philip, who had now collected an army much larger than his, pursued him closely, intending to crush the little English force in a corner between the Somme and the sea. He halted at Airanes, and sent two marshals with a large body of troops to endeavour to find or force a passage across the Somme. When they returned unsuccessful he was much troubled; for both he and all his army saw that they were in pressing danger. Early on the 23rd he left Airanes in haste, and the French, who arrived there shortly afterwards, found the meat that the English were about to eat on the spits. His object now was to gain Abbeville. On arriving before it he reconnoitred the town in person from the hills of Caubert, and finding that he could not take it fell back on Oisemont, which he carried easily by assault. Here a man offered to guide his army to a ford called Blanquetaque, above the village of Port, where he could cross at low water. He gave the order to march at midnight, and on arriving at the passage found it guarded by Godemar du Fay. After a sharp struggle the passage was forced (Avesbury; Froissart; by *Cont.* of Will. of Nangis, ii. 200, Godemar is unjustly accused of making only a slight resistance), and he and his army crossed into Ponthieu. Edward was now able to choose his own ground for fighting; for Philip, who had been just too late to prevent his crossing the river, was not able to follow him immediately, and turned aside to Abbeville. Edward took the castle of Noyelles, held a council of war, and the next day, the 25th, marched along the road between Havre and Flanders to Crécy. On Saturday the 26th Philip advanced from Abbeville to give him battle. Edward had chosen and strengthened his position with great skill. His army occupied some high ground on the right bank of the Maye: the right wing was covered by the river and the village of Crécy, where it was defended by a series of curtains, the left extended towards Wadicourt, and here, where it might have been open to a flank attack, it was barricaded by piles of wagons; the English front commanded a slight ravine called the Vallée-aux-Clercs; the baggage and horses, for all fought on foot, were placed in the rear on the left in a wood, and were imparked with thickets and felled trees. His position thus resembled an entrenched camp. In case of defeat he commanded the ancient causeway now called the Chemin de l'Armée, by which he could have crossed the Authie at Ponche (Seymour de Constant; Louandre; *Archæologia*, vol. xxxviii.) Early in the morning he and his son received the sacrament. Then he drew up his army in three divisions, placing the right wing or van under the command of the prince; the third division, which he commanded in person, forming a reserve. He rode through the lines on a palfrey, encouraging the men, and at 10 A.M. all sat down in their ranks to eat and drink. The archers were thrown forwards in the form of a harrow, and some small cannon were posted between them (Froissart, iii. 416; *Amiens MS.*; Gio. Villani, xii. c. 65, 66; *Istorie Pistolesi*, p. 516. This assertion has been much questioned, chiefly because it does not appear in the earliest text of Froissart, and because it is held to be unlikely that Edward would have taken cannon with him in his hasty march. The presence of the Genoese in the French army, however, invests the two contemporary Italian narratives with special authority, and it should be remembered that the cannon then used were extremely small. It is certain that Edward took cannon with him from England; Brackenbury; *Archæologia*, vol. xxxii.) Edward watched the battle from a mill. It began after the heavy shower which came on at 3 P.M. had cleared away, and lasted until nightfall. It was decided by bad generalship and want of discipline on the French side, and on the English side by the skill of the bowmen and the steady valour of the two front divisions [see under Edward, Prince of Wales]. Edward appears to have led forward his division when the French king took part in the fight; the two first lines of the French army had by that time been utterly broken, and the remainder was soon routed. He remained on the field the next day, and large numbers of the French, some of whom were fugitives, while others were advancing to join the king's army not knowing that it had already been routed, were massacred

almost without resistance; many prisoners were also made on this day. The whole loss of the French exceeded, we are told, and was probably about equal to, the number of the English army (Avesbury, p. 140), and among the slain were the king of Bohemia, the Duke of Lorraine, the Counts of Alençon, Harcourt, Flanders, Blois, Aumale, and Nevers, eighty bannerets, and perhaps about thirty thousand men of lower rank. Edward caused the knights who had fallen to be buried honourably, and gave special funeral honours to the king of Bohemia.

On the 28th the king began his march towards Calais, arrived before the town on 3 Sept. and determined to lay siege to it (*ib.* p. 136); it was a strong place, and the inhabitants had done much harm to the English and Flemings by their piracies (Gio. Villani, xii. c. 95). He built a regular town before the walls (Froissart, iv. 2, 203), sent for a fleet to blockade the harbour, and laid siege to the town with about thirty thousand men. He used cannon in the siege which threw balls of three or four ounces weight, and arrows fitted with leather and winged with brass (Brackenbury). When the governor expelled five hundred persons from the town in order to husband his provisions, the king fed them and gave them money for their journey (Jehan le Bel, ii. 96; Froissart magnifies the number to seventeen hundred, iv. 3, 204). Knighton (c. 2593), speaking probably of a later event, says that when, at the time that the town was suffering from famine, five hundred persons were expelled, Edward refused to allow them to pass his lines, and they all perished. Meanwhile the Scots, who at Philip's instance had invaded England, were routed at Nevill's Cross, Durham, on 17 Oct., and there King David was taken prisoner and confined in the Tower; Derby made himself master of nearly all Guyenne, and in the summer of 1347 the English cause prospered in Brittany, and Charles of Blois was made prisoner. In April some stores were brought into Calais by sea, and after this Edward ordered a stricter blockade; his fleet dispersed a convoy of forty-four ships laden with provisions on 25 June (Avesbury, p. 156), and the next day a letter was intercepted from the governor to the French king informing him of the starving condition of the garrison, and asking for relief. Edward sent the letter on to Philip, bidding him come to the relief of the town (Knighton, c. 2593). In July Philip led an army towards Calais. A portion of it sent to dislodge the Flemings who were acting with Edward at Quesnoy was defeated. He appeared at Sangatte on the 27th. Two cardinals in vain tried to make terms in his interests. He was unable to get at the English, who were securely posted behind the marshes, and challenged Edward to come out to battle. Edward declared that he accepted the challenge (Avesbury, p. 163); it is probable that he answered more wisely (Jehan le Bel, ii. 131; Froissart, iv. 50, 278). Anyway, two days later, on 2 Aug., the French decamped. The next day the town surrendered at discretion. The garrison came forth with swords reversed, and a deputation of the townsmen with bare heads and ropes in their hands. Edward at first intended, or made as though he intended, to put the inhabitants to the sword as a punishment for their piracies, but spared them at the intercession of his queen (Jehan le Bel, ii. 135; Froissart, iv. 57, 287; see also Luce's note in his *Summary*, p. xxv; there is no adequate reason for doubting any material part of this famous story, comp. Knighton, c. 2595; Stow, p. 244; Gio. Villani, xii. c. 95; nor is the incident of the self-devotion of Eustace de St.-Pierre improbable). During the summer his army suffered much sickness, arising from lack of good water. With some few exceptions he banished the people of Calais; and sent over to England offering grants and privileges to those who would colonise the town (*Fœdera*, iii. 130). After agreeing to a truce for nine months, mediated by Clement and signed 28 Sept. (*ib.* p. 136), he returned home with his wife and son, and after a stormy passage landed at Sandwich on 12 Oct. (*ib.* p. 139; *Cont.* Murimuth, p. 178).

All England was filled with the spoils of Edward's expedition, so that there was not a woman who did not wear some ornament, or have in her house fine linen or some goblet, part of the booty the king sent home from Caen or brought back from Calais (Walsingham, i. 272). Flushed with triumph Edward and his courtiers gave themselves up to extravagance and pleasure. During the three months after his return splendid tournaments were held at Bury, at Eltham, where 'garters' were worn by twelve of the knights, and at Windsor (Nicolas, *Orders of Knighthood*, i. 11 sq.) Much license prevailed at some of the meetings of this sort, which were attended by many ladies of loose life and bold manners, greatly to the scandal of the nation (Knighton, c. 2597). The king freely indulged his love for fine dress and the trappings of chivalry. On St. George's day, 23 April 1349, he carried out the plan for an order of knighthood formed in 1344 by the institution of the order of the Garter; the ceremonies and festivities were magnificent. Edward himself bore a 'white swan, gorged or,' with the vaunting motto, 'Hay, hay, the

wythe swan: By God's soul I am thy man.' Another of his mottoes was, 'It is as it is.' The origin of the 'Garter' and of the motto of the order is unknown. The story that connects them with the Countess of Salisbury is worthless, and is first found in 'Polydore Vergil,' p. 485 (ed. 1651). In connection with the foundation of the order, Edward rebuilt the chapel of Windsor and dedicated it to St. George, and refounded the college (Ashmole, p. 178). Early in 1348 messengers came to Edward from the heads of the Bavarian party in the empire inviting him to accept the imperial dignity; for Lewis of Bavaria was now dead, and their enemy Clement VI was advocating the election of Charles of Moravia. Edward, however, declined the honour, declaring that he preferred to prosecute his own right (Knighton, c. 2596; Gio. Villani, xii. c. 105; Raynaldus, xxiv. 468). In spite of the spoils of France the expenses of the war bore heavily on the country. During the king's absence money had been raised by various illegal methods, and the refusal of the commons in the parliament of January 1348 to give advice on the war shows that they feared further expense and would not take a share in the responsibility. After some strong complaints a grant for three years was made on certain conditions, one of which was that the king should restore a loan of twenty thousand sacks of wool that the council had obtained from the merchants without consent of parliament (*Const. Hist.* ii. 397 sq.) In August the plague reached this country, broke out in London in November, and raged with fearful violence in the summer of 1349; no parliament was held that year, and all the courts were closed for two years. A murrain broke out among cattle; the harvest rotted on the land for lack of reapers, and a time of scarcity followed. This first plague remained more or less till 1357. About half the population was swept off, three archbishops of Canterbury died within a twelvemonth, and one of the king's daughters, Joan, died of it in August 1348 at Bordeaux while on her way to meet her betrothed husband, Don Pedro of Castile. The diminution of the population caused wages to be doubled, and in June 1350 the king published an ordinance requiring labourers to work for the same wages as before the plague and providing penalties for demanding or granting more. On 9 Feb. 1351 the statute of labourers was enacted in parliament, and other attempts were made later in the reign to keep down wages and prevent labourers from migrating to different parts of the country to seek higher pay, but without much effect. (For information on the plague see Rogers, *History of Prices*, i. 60, 265, 667, and article in *Fortnightly Review*, vol. iii.; art. 'Plague,' *Encyclopædia Brit.* 9th ed.; Knighton, c. 2699 sq.)

Towards the end of 1349 Edward was informed by the governor of Calais that the French hoped to gain possession of the town by paying him a sum of money on 1 Jan. He put Sir Walter Manny at the head of three hundred knights, among whom he served as a simple knight, crossed over to Calais, surprised the party which came to receive the surrender, and distinguished himself by his valour, engaging in single combat with Sir Eustace de Ribaumont, whom he made prisoner. After the fight he sat down to a feast with his prisoners, crowned Sir Eustace with a chaplet of pearls and gave him his liberty (Jehan le Bel, p. 1351; Froissart, iv. 81, 313). During the summer of 1350 a fleet was fitted out, for Edward desired to take vengeance on the fleet of Charles of La Cerda, grandson of Alfonso X of Castile, which had been largely employed by the French against him. On 10 Aug. he declared that this fleet, which was lying at Sluys, threatened to invade England (*Fœdera*, iii. 201), though it seems at the time to have been engaged in commerce. He embarked at Winchelsea in the cog Thomas on the 28th, to intercept the Spaniards, whose fleet was much stronger than his own. The next day, which was Sunday, he sat on deck in a black velvet jacket and beaver hat listening to music and singing, but looking earnestly for the signal of the enemy's approach (Froissart, iv. 91). The Spanish fleet of forty large galleys laden with merchandise hove in sight about 4 P.M. A severe fight took place, and the king behaved with much gallantry, changing his ship for one of the Spaniards which he had taken just before his own sank. He gained a complete victory, the number of ships taken being variously estimated from fourteen to twenty-six. In the evening he landed and spent the night in revelry with the queen and her ladies and his knights; for this battle, which is called L'Espagnols-sur-mer, took place but a few miles off Winchelsea, where the court was, and within sight of land (Nicolas, *Royal Navy*, ii. 103–13, where references are given). On 1 Aug. 1351 a truce was made with the maritime ports of Castile and Biscay (*Fœdera*, iii. 228). In the February parliament of this year was passed the statute of Provisors, by which all who procured reservation or provisions were rendered liable to fine and imprisonment; for the king's letter and ordinance of 1344 had proved ineffectual, and

bishoprics and other benefices were still granted by the pope, and in many cases to foreigners, so that the wealth of the kingdom went to enrich the king's enemies, and the interests of the church suffered. This was followed in 1353 by an ordinance directed against papal usurpation in matters of jurisdiction, which provided that all who sued in foreign courts should suffer outlawry, forfeiture, and imprisonment. This ordinance, which was enrolled as a statute, was called the statute of Præmunire. In 1365 the statute of Provisors was re-enacted, and the statute of Præmunire was expressly declared to apply to suitors at the papal court. The crime of treason was defined for the first time by the statute of Treasons in 1352, and in 1353 the staple towns for the monopoly and export of wool were finally fixed by an ordinance that was adopted by parliament the next year (*Const. Hist.* ii. 410, iii. 327 sq.)

Although the truce with France was renewed from time to time, it was constantly broken. In 1351 Guisnes was sold to Edward by the garrison, some fighting went on in Guyenne, and more in Brittany. On both sides John, who had succeeded his father Philip in 1350, lost ground. Pope Innocent VI endeavoured to bring about a final peace, and an effort to that end seems to have been made by Edward, who sent the Duke of Lancaster (before Earl of Derby) to treat at Guisnes in July 1353, offering to give up his claim to the crown on condition of receiving Guyenne, Normandy, and Ponthieu, his conquests in Brittany and elsewhere, and the overlordship of Flanders, all in full sovereignty (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 252; *Fœdera*, iii. 261). These demands, however, were too high. Still he was probably willing to make peace, for he made renewed offers in March 1354, and a truce was signed a few days later (*ib.* pp. 275, 277). Moreover in the parliament of 10 April the king sent a message by his chamberlain to the lords and commons informing them that there was good hope of peace, and asking the commons if they would assent to a full peace if one could be made, and they answered unanimously, 'Yes, yes' (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 262). Accordingly, on 23 Aug. he authorised Lancaster and others to treat at Avignon before Innocent (*Fœdera*, iii. 283, 289). The negotiations were ineffectual. At Avignon Lancaster met Charles of Navarre, who had a quarrel with his father-in-law, King John, and who now proposed an alliance with Edward. His friendship was of importance, for he had many strong towns in Normandy. He promised to co-operate with Edward in an invasion of France by Normandy, and on 1 June 1355 the king desired prayers for the success of his expedition. On 10 July Edward took command of his fleet at the Downs, intending to land at Cherbourg (Knighton, c. 2608). He was delayed by contrary winds, put in at Sandwich and Winchelsea, was at Westminster on 30 Aug., and then went down to Portsmouth, apparently hoping to cross. While he was there he heard that Charles and the king of France were reconciled, and that John was threatening Calais (*Fœdera*, iii. 311, 312; Avesbury, p. 202). He therefore crossed over to Calais. Meanwhile the Prince of Wales had sailed with a large force for Guyenne. At Calais Edward was joined by a mercenary force of Brabanters and others, and on 2 Nov. marched to meet the French king, who refused to give battle and retreated. After pillaging the country for four days he returned to Calais, and there heard that the Scots had taken Berwick (*ib.* p. 210). He hastened home, and after receiving a large grant from parliament left London about 30 Nov., was at Durham on 23 Dec., when he issued orders that the forces of nine shires should meet him at Newcastle on 1 Jan. (*Fœdera*, iii. 314), and, having spent Christmas at Newcastle, marched to Berwick, which was surrendered to him on the 13th after slight resistance. He then proceeded to Roxburgh, where on the 20th Baliol surrendered the kingdom and kingly dignity to him (*ib.* pp. 317–19). On the 27th he left Roxburgh, at the head of thirty-three thousand men (Avesbury, p. 235), and marched into Lothian. The Scots would not meet him in battle, had driven away their cattle, and as far as possible had stripped the land. Edward harried the country and fired all that could be burned, so that his expedition was known as the Burnt Candlemas. His army was soon in want of supplies; he marched to Edinburgh hoping to meet his ships with supplies, for he had given orders at Berwick that they should sail into the Firth. They had, however, been dispersed by a tempest, and he was forced to lead his army southwards, the Scots cutting off the stragglers, and once, it is said, nearly taking the king himself (Knighton, c. 2610; Fordun, p. 1048).

On 10 Oct. Edward addressed a letter to the bishops commanding a thanksgiving for his son's victory at Poitiers and the capture of the French king on 19 Sept.; the gravity and religious feeling he displayed on receiving the news of this wonderful success were widely spoken of with praise (M. Villani, vii. c. 21). On 23 March 1357 a truce for two years was concluded with France, and on 24 May Edward received the Prince of Wales and the captive king with much splendour at Westminster. In June three cardinals came to England to

negotiate a peace; they offered Edward the lands that his ancestors held in France, to which Edward replied shortly that though these lands had been lost he had regained them, and that they had better speak of his claim to the throne (*Fœdera*, iii. 357; Knighton, c. 2616). Innocent now requested that Edward would pay him the tribute of a thousand marks that his ancestor John had promised; the king, however, declared that he would pay tribute to no one, for that he did not hold his kingdom in dependence on any one (*ib.* c. 2617); some payments had been made on this account in the earlier part of the reign (*Fœdera*, ii. 864). On 3 Oct. a long series of negotiations, kept up more or less during ten years, for the release of the king of Scots was brought to an end. Peace was made between the two kingdoms, and David was released at a ransom of 100,000*l.*, to be paid in yearly instalments, for which hostages were given (*ib.* iii. 372 sq.) David's long residence in England had made him English in heart; he was completely under Edward's influence, and constantly visited his court. The presence of King John, who was honourably lodged in the Savoy, led Edward into fresh extravagance. On 23 April, St. George's day, 1358, he held a magnificent tournament at Windsor, and he kept Christmas in much state at London, where he entertained the kings of France and Scotland. In March 1359 a treaty was made between the kings of England and France by which John surrendered to Edward the whole of the south-east of France from Poitou to Gascony, with Calais, Guisnes, and Ponthieu in full sovereignty, and was to ransom himself and his lords for four million crowns, while Edward gave up his claims to the crown and the provinces north of the Loire, formerly held by his ancestors. This treaty was repudiated by the regent of France, with the consent of the States-General, and Edward prepared for war. The Flemings, who were now on good terms with their count, had deserted the English alliance and now drove the English merchants into Brabant. On the other hand Sir Robert Knolles and other leaders of the free companies that desolated France put themselves under Edward's command, and so many foreign lords and knights flocked to Calais to serve under him, that he was forced to send Lancaster to satisfy them by leading them on a plundering expedition. Having raised an immense force, and furnished it with everything that could be needed during a long campaign, he sailed from Sandwich on 28 Oct. and arrived at Calais the same day (*Fœdera*, iii. 452). The adventurers, who had gained little booty by their raid, were clamorous for pay, but he told them that he had nothing for them, and that they might please themselves as to serving under him, though he would give those who did so a good share of the spoil (Jehan le Bel, ii. 251). He marched through Artois and Cambresis to Rheims, where he intended to be crowned king of France (*Cont.* Will. of Nangis, ii. 297), and laid siege to the city on 30 Nov. The regent did not attack him, but the city was strong, and as his men suffered from the weather and bad quarters, he broke up the siege on 11 Jan. 1360, led his army into Burgundy, and took Tonnerre, where his soldiers were refreshed with three thousand butts of wine. After remaining there some days he removed to Guillon on the borders of the duchy, encamped there on 19 Feb., and remained till mid-Lent. On 10 March Duke Philip bought him off by a payment of two hundred thousand gold 'moutons' (*Fœdera*, iii. 473), and he then marched to Paris and encamped between Montlhéry and Châtres, lodging at the castle of St. Germain-lez-Arpajon. He did not succeed in provoking the regent to battle, and on 6 April marched towards the Loire, intending to refresh his men in Brittany and commence operations again later in the year. Meanwhile, on 15 March, a Norman fleet appeared at Winchelsea, carrying a large force of soldiers, who plundered the town and were at last driven to their ships. The regent now pressed for peace, and on 8 May Edward concluded a treaty at Bretigny, near Chartres. By this treaty the whole of the ancient province of Aquitaine, together with Calais, Guisnes, and Ponthieu, was ceded to him, and he renounced his claim to the crown, to the provinces north of the Loire, and to the overlordship of Flanders; the right to Brittany was left undecided, and provision was made that any future struggle for the duchy between the two competitors should not involve a breach of the treaty, and John's ransom was fixed at three million gold crowns, of the value of two to the English noble, six thousand to be paid in four months, and hostages to be delivered, and the king to be then set free. Edward returned thanks in the cathedral of Chartres, and then embarked at Honfleur (not Harfleur as Froissart has it, for it was then in French hands), and landed at Rye on the 18th. On 9 Oct. he crossed to Calais, and on the 24th finally ratified the treaty of Bretigny, in the church of St. Nicolas, received payment and hostages, and liberated John, to whom he accorded the title of king of France, while he forebore to use it himself (*ib.* pp. 515 sq.) He returned to England at the beginning of

November and kept Christmas at Woodstock (Walsingham, i. 294).

On 15 March 1361 Edward issued a writ to the chancellor of Ireland speaking of the increasing weakness of his faithful subjects in that country, and declaring his intention of sending over his son Lionel, earl of Ulster in right of his wife, with a large army (*Fœdera*, iii. 610). Ever since the murder of William de Burgh [q. v.], earl of Ulster, in 1332, the English settlement in Ireland had grown continually weaker. The De Burghs refused to acknowledge the earl's daughter, Elizabeth, who was brought up as the king's ward and was now Lionel's wife; they assumed Irish names and became 'more Irish than the Irish themselves,' and their example was followed by many other houses of Anglo-Norman descent. Further causes of weakness were the heavy drain of soldiers for the king's wars, the constant quarrels between the colonists, and the corrupt state of the administration. Holders of public offices in Ireland were simply engaged in a race for wealth, and as Edward's wars rendered him unable to pay them regularly, they obtained money as they could. Although the king's visit, proposed in 1331, never took place, he made several attempts to check the decay of the colony. In 1338 he ordered that all justices should be Englishmen by birth (*ib.* ii. 1019), and in 1341 that all officers settled in Ireland should be removed unless they held estates in England (*ib.* p. 1171). In 1341, however, in order to raise money and to crush the power of the rebellious party, the English by blood, he declared a resumption of crown grants. The opposition of Desmond compelled the abandonment of the measure, and the attempt embittered the relations between the two parties (Bagwell, *Ireland under the Tudors*, i. 70–9). Edward endeavoured to provide for the defence of the colony by checking absenteeism (*Fœdera*, iii. 153, 253), and in 1357 issued an ordinance for the better government of the country, which confirmed the institution of annual parliaments introduced in the last reign. In 1361 he decreed that no 'mere Irish' should hold any secular office or ecclesiastical benefice within the country subject to the crown; and a wider attempt to separate the two races and put a stop to the adoption of Irish customs by the English colonists was made by the statute of Kilkenny in 1367 [see under Lionel, Duke of Clarence]. The English districts were now formally distinguished from the Irish. Edward's legislation, however, failed to strengthen the power of the crown in Ireland, and the English colony decayed during his reign. This year was marked by a second visitation of the plague, which lasted from August till the following May. As peace was now made with France, the king on 16 Feb. restored the possessions of the alien priories. In spite of the peace France was desolated by the free companies commanded by Sir Hugh Calveley [q. v.] and other Englishmen, and largely composed of the king's subjects, and at John's request Edward ordered his officers to check their disorders (*Fœdera*, iii. 630, 685). Early in 1362 knights from Spain, Cyprus, and Armenia visited the king, requesting his help against Mahometan invaders, and in May he entertained them with jousts at Smithfield. He now seems to have neglected his kingly duties, and his licentiousness and indolence were made the subjects of popular satire (*Political Songs*, i. 182 sq.) On 19 July he created Gascony and Aquitaine into a principality, which he conferred on the Prince of Wales (*ib.* p. 607), to be held by liege homage, and in his charter of grant declared that he might hereafter erect these dominions into a kingdom, and reserved the right of such erection, a power which was universally held to belong only to the emperor or the pope. This year the king began to keep the jubilee year of his age; he pardoned many prisoners and outlaws, and created his sons, Lionel and John, Dukes of Clarence and Lancaster, a title which he had introduced into England, and which had as yet been conferred only on the Prince of Wales and Henry of Lancaster, lately deceased. These creations point to the influence of French usage; the king evidently intended that this new title should be reserved for members of his family, to whom he wished to give a position somewhat similar to that of the 'princes of the lilies.' As the great fiefs of France, such as Normandy and Anjou, had been made *apanages* for the king's sons, so Edward was carrying out a scheme of policy which invested the members of the royal house with some of the richest fiefs of the English crown. The Prince of Wales, who was also Earl of Chester and Duke of Cornwall, married the heiress of the Earl of Kent. The wife of Lionel brought him, in addition to the earldom of Ulster, a portion of the inheritance of the Earls of Gloucester and Hereford; and John, who had received the earldom of Richmond from his father, held four other earldoms in right of his wife, the daughter of Henry, duke of Lancaster. By thus concentrating the great fiefs in his own family Edward hoped to strengthen the crown against the nobles (on this subject see *Const. Hist.* ii. 416). In the parliament of October the king was granted a subsidy for three years. The custom of making grants

for two or three years enabled the king to hold parliaments less frequently—none, for example, met in 1364—and encouraged legislation by ordinances of the king and council instead of by statute (*ib.* p. 409). This parliament obtained a statute providing that, forasmuch as 'the French tongue is much unknown,' all pleadings should for the future be in English in all courts of law; and it was further enacted that the records should be kept in Latin instead of French. This statute was evidently considered an act of grace worthy of the jubilee (*ib.* p. 414; *Rot. Parl.* ii. 275, 283; *Cont.* Murimuth, p. 198). Next year the chancellor opened parliament with an English speech. Two important concessions were also obtained in 1362: the one provided that no tax should be laid on wool without the consent of parliament, the other related to purveyance. Simon Islip, archbishop of Canterbury, had lately remonstrated indignantly with the king on the hardships inflicted on his subjects by the conduct of his purveyors (*Speculum Regis*, MS. Bodl. 624, quoted in *Const. Hist.* ii. 375, 404, 414), and Edward now granted a statute limiting purveyance to the use of the king or queen, ordering that all payments on that account should be made in money, and changing the name 'purveyor' to that of 'buyer.' In the autumn of 1363 the king, in commemoration of his jubilee, held great huntings in Rockingham, Sherburn, and other forests, on which he expended 100*l.* and a hundred marks on alternate days (Knighton, c. 2627). In the course of the winter he entertained four kings. Peter of Cyprus came to persuade him to go on a crusade, but Edward declared that he was too old. Waldemar IV of Denmark also consulted him on the same matter, and the kings of France and Scotland had business connected with their ransoms. One of John's hostages, his son the Duke of Anjou, broke his parole and refused to return to Calais, and the French king, partly from a feeling of honour and partly because he longed for the pleasures of Edward's court (*Cont.* Will. of Nangis, ii. 333), returned to England, and died at the Savoy Palace on 8 April 1364.

From the date of David's release in 1357 Edward took every means to gain a party in Scotland; he welcomed Scottish nobles who came to share in the chivalrous amusements of his court, or, as some did, took service under his banner, encouraged trade between the two countries, and allowed the inhabitants of the districts which remained in his hands to enjoy their own customs. Meanwhile the annual sum due for the king's ransom pressed heavily on the people and fell into arrear. Edward hoped that the Scots would be willing to accept him or one of his sons as David's successor, and so be relieved of this obligation. David, who was childless and completely under Edward's influence, on 27 Nov. 1363, during his visit to Westminster, made a secret treaty with the English king, by which it was agreed that if he could persuade his subjects to accept Edward and his heirs as his successors on the throne of Scotland, the districts then held by Edward should be restored and an acquittance given for the remainder of the ransom; the kingdom of Scotland was not to be merged in that of England, the English king was to receive the Scottish crown at Scone, seated on the royal stone, which was to be sent back from England, and all parliaments relating to Scottish affairs were to be held in Scotland (*Fœdera*, iii. 715). This project for a union of the kingdoms was defeated by the determination of the Scots never to allow an Englishman to reign over them (Tytler, *History of Scotland*, i. 205–15). In the beginning of October Edward heard of the victory of Auray, where Chandos and Calveley destroyed the army of Charles of Blois, who was slain in the battle, and won Brittany for De Montfort. He was at this time treating for a marriage between his son Edmund, earl of Cambridge, and Margaret, heiress of Lewis, count of Flanders, and widow of Philip de Rouvre, duke of Burgundy. A dispensation was necessary, and Charles V, the new king of France, persuaded Urban V to refuse it, and afterwards obtained the lady and her rich and wide territories for his brother Philip (*Fœdera*, iii. 750, 758; *Cont.* Murimuth, p. 200; Barante, *Ducs de Bourgogne*, i. 39 sq.) In May 1366 Simon Langham, bishop of Ely, the chancellor, announced to the parliament that the king desired the advice of the estates, for he had been informed by the pope that he purposed to commence a suit against him for the tribute of a thousand marks which had been promised by John in acknowledgment of homage for the kingdom of England and land of Ireland, and which was then thirty-three years in arrear. The three estates answered with one accord that John had no power to make any such promise, and the temporal lords and the commons declared that should the pope attempt to enforce his claim they would resist him. Edward was so indignant at the pope's conduct that for a short time he even forbade the payment of Peter's pence. This was the last that was heard of the tribute to Rome (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 289, 290; Stow, p. 277). It is said that about this time Edward, who had made some rather feeble attempts to induce the English free companies

to abstain from ravaging France, received a strong remonstrance from Charles V on the subject, that he then renewed his commands to the great company, and that its leaders refused to obey him. Indignant at this, he made, it is said, preparations for crossing over to France in order to make war upon them; but Charles, when he heard of his intention, requested him to abandon it, on which the king swore by St. Mary, his usual oath, that he would never go to the help of the king of France, even though the company should turn him out of his kingdom (Walsingham, i. 302). The company, however, now found employment in Castile. Henry of Trastamare, the bastard brother of Pedro the Cruel, king of Castile, conspired against his brother, with the connivance of Charles V. The pope and the king of Aragon engaged the help of Du Guesclin, who was joined by Calveley and other English captains, and turned Pedro out of his kingdom. Pedro, with whom Edward had made alliance in 1362 and 1364 (*Fœdera*, iii. 656, 686), fled to the Prince of Wales at Bordeaux, and requested his help. The prince applied to his father, and Edward consented to his undertaking the cause of Pedro, and furnished Lancaster, who went out to join his brother, with troops and ships for his passage (*ib.* pp. 799, 810). On 5 July 1367 the king received the charger ridden by Henry of Trastamare at Najara, where he was defeated by the prince and Pedro on 3 April (*ib.* p. 825). This war was not an infraction of the peace between England and France. In November the king, to whom Charles of France had again complained of the injuries inflicted on his kingdom by the free companies, wrote to the prince and others urgently requiring them to repress these disorders (*ib.* p. 834). This, however, was beyond their power, and early the next year a large number of soldiers who had served in Spain left Aquitaine under their captains and entered France. Charles, who was determined to win back the territories conquered by the English, and was only biding his time, now had a fair cause of complaint, especially as these soldiers declared that they were acting in obedience to the prince's suggestion (Froissart, vii. 66). He encouraged the discontent of the communes of Guyenne and of Albret and Armagnac and other lords who had never submitted willingly to the English rule, and strengthened his party in the south. Edward was warned by the prince that mischief was brewing, but refused to believe it, for some of his advisers told him that the prince was rash and restless, that the king of France meant no harm, and that he need take no account of his son's letters (Walsingham, i. 306). He was deceived by the semblance of amity that Charles kept up. The instalments of the late king's ransom were still paid (18 Nov. 1367, *Fœdera*, iii. 836), and in May 1368 the Duke of Clarence, when on his way to Milan, where he married Violante Visconti, was nobly entertained at Paris. In July Charles entered into an open alliance with Henry of Trastamare, who promised to deliver him any conquests he might make at Edward's expense (*ib.* p. 850), and in the summer and autumn received as suzerain appeals against the prince from Albret and Armagnac in spite of the treaty of Bretigny. In January 1369 he summoned the prince to appear before him and answer the complaints of his subjects; yet he still kept up friendly relations with Edward, sent ambassadors to his court to treat of their differences, and gave him a present of fifty pipes of wine. Nevertheless it was now evident that war was likely to break out, and Edward ordered a levy of archers and mariners to be made in the western counties to meet 'our enemies of France, now on the sea,' and on 20 March sent letters directing that preparations should be made to resist invasion (*ib.* pp. 858, 863). In April Edward returned the French king's wine, and the ambassadors left the court. They were met at Dover on the 29th by Charles's messenger with a declaration of war. This was, it is said, sent by one of the French king's scullions. Edward was indignant at the insult, and returned no answer (Froissart, vii. 109). The story is open to suspicion, for the insult was senseless, shocking to the feelings of the age, and unlike the general conduct of the 'wise' king. Anyway, on the very day that war was declared the French invaded Ponthieu, and conquered it in a week. Although Edward had made some preparations for war, he was by no means ready, and was surprised by the suddenness of the French attack. He received a subsidy for three years from the parliament that met on 4 May; by the advice of the estates he again assumed the title and arms of king of France, and sent reinforcements to act on the frontiers of Aquitaine under the Earls of Cambridge and Pembroke. A kind of treaty of neutrality had been made with Aragon shortly before the war began (*ib.* p. 855); the truce with Scotland, which was nearly expired, was renewed for fourteen years (*ib.* p. 877); and though the marriage of Margaret of Burgundy rendered it useless to hope for active help from the Count of Flanders, ambassadors were sent to him, who succeeded the next year in concluding a treaty for commerce providing that Flemish ships should not carry the goods of the enemies of

England (*ib.* p. 898). Agreements were also made with the margrave of Juliers and the Duke of Gueldres for the supply of mercenaries.

On the English side the war was carried on without any of the vigour of earlier days, for the king was sinking into premature old age and the prince was mortally sick. Edward's hold on his French dominions was slight, and his subjects were ready to return to their old allegiance as soon as ever they should find that it was safe to do so. Accordingly Charles declined to risk a battle, and allowed the English to wear themselves out with fruitless operations. While Chandos and Pembroke carried on a desultory warfare in Poitou and Touraine, Charles gathered a considerable army and many ships at Harfleur, and in August an invasion of England seemed near at hand (*ib.* p. 878). Edward sent Lancaster with a body of troops to Calais, and if any idea of an invasion on a large scale had existed it was given up. Nevertheless an attack was made on Portsmouth, and the town was burnt (*ib.* p. 880), an incident which proves how entirely the king had neglected the naval and coast defences of the country during some years past, for this attack was not unexpected. The French army was commanded by the Duke of Burgundy, who, in obedience to the king's orders, refused to give battle to the English. Lancaster, with some foreign troops under Robert of Namur, did some plundering, and in November returned home. During the summer of this year England suffered from a third visitation of the plague. On 15 Aug. Edward sustained a serious loss in the death of his queen. Even during her lifetime he had formed a connection with one of her attendants named Alice Perrers (*Chron. Angliæ*, p. 95), and after her death this woman exercised an overweening and disastrous power over him. From this event, too, may perhaps be dated the rapid growth of Lancaster's influence over his father, and of the rivalry between him and the Prince of Wales, though some signs of that may probably be discerned in the evil counsel which led Edward to neglect the prince's warnings as to the intentions of the king of France. During 1370 the war in France went on with varying success. The English lost ground in Aquitaine; Sir Robert Knolles plundered up to the gates of Paris, was defeated, and retired to Brittany; and Limoges was betrayed to the French, and was retaken by the prince. Edward endeavoured to conciliate his French subjects, and took measures that weakened the authority of the prince, and were evidently suggested by Lancaster. On 30 Dec. 1369 he set up a court of appeal at Saintes (*Fœdera*, iii. 884); on 28 Jan. 1370 he abated certain duties on wine; on 1 July he sent out Lancaster to help his brother, granting him extraordinary powers; and on 5 or 15 Nov. he declared the abolition of all *fouages*, the tax by which the prince had roused the Gascons to revolt, and other aids (Froissart, vii. 210, 211). In January he received a grant of a tenth for three years from the clergy. In accordance with the bad advice of some of his counsellors he borrowed largely from his subjects for the expenses of the war (*Cont.* Murimuth, p. 207), and in consequence of the grant of the year before did not summon a parliament. He had received a visit from the king of Navarre, and made a treaty with him, but this treaty was annulled on 27 Jan. in consequence of the prince's refusal to assent to it (*ib.* p. 210; *Fœdera*, iii. 907).

In January 1371 Edward received the Prince of Wales at Windsor on his return home in broken health, and then went up to Westminster and was present at the parliament of 24 Feb. The chancellor, William of Wykeham, bishop of Winchester, declared the king's need of supplies to enable him to prevent invasion. A petition from the monastic landowners was made the opportunity for an attack on the wealth of the church, which was, a certain lord said, like an owl dressed in the plumage of other birds, until a moment of peril came and each bird reclaimed its own feathers (*Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, Pref. p. xxi). The attack was led by the Earl of Pembroke, who was betrothed to the king's daughter Margaret, and it probably, therefore, met with the king's approval. A petition, in which both lords and commons joined, was presented to the king declaring that the government of the kingdom had been for a long time in the hands of churchmen who could not be called to account, and praying that the king would choose lay ministers. Wykeham and the treasurer Brantingham, bishop of Exeter, resigned their offices, and the king appointed two laymen to succeed them. The ignorance of the new ministers was at once displayed in the proposal to raise 50,000*l.* by a contribution of 22*s.* 3*d.* from every one of the parishes in England, the larger to help the smaller, for it was found that there were not nine thousand parishes; and in June the king called a great council at Winchester, consisting of some lords and one representative from each constituency, and with their consent the proportion to be levied on each parish was raised proportionately. A grant of 50,000*l.* was also made by the clergy (*Const. Hist.* ii. 420 sq.; *Rot. Parl.* ii. 303, 304; *Fœ-*

dera, iii. 911; *Cont.* MURIMUTH, p. 210; WILKINS, *Concilia*, iii. 94). No incident of any importance took place in the war during this year; Lancaster, who commanded in Aquitaine, did little good, and the French gained ground in Poitou. In the parliament of this year the commons presented a petition to the king representing the lamentable condition of the navy and the mismanagement of all maritime affairs. Much ill-will existed between the English and Flemish sailors, and, probably early in 1372, some English ships fell in with a Flemish fleet coming from Brittany with salt, and after a fierce engagement, in which the Flemish are said to have been the aggressors, defeated them and took twenty-five prizes (FROISSART, i. 631, ed. Buchon; *Cont.* MURIMUTH, p. 211; WALSINGHAM, i. 313). On the following 5 April the peace between Edward and the Count of Flanders was renewed (*Fœdera*, iii. 939, 953). Negotiations which had been opened with Edward's old ally, the Duke of Brittany, in November 1371, were brought to a conclusion by an offensive and defensive league between the king and the duke on 19 July following (*ib.* pp. 926, 953). Gregory XI endeavoured to make peace between England and France and accredited two cardinals, one a Frenchman and the other Simon Langham, sometime archbishop of Canterbury, to carry on negotiations, but they were unable to effect anything (*ib.* p. 935). In January 1372 Edward made a treaty with the republic of Genoa, which agreed not to furnish help to his enemies (*ib.* p. 931). On the other hand, the marriages of Lancaster and Cambridge with the two daughters of Pedro the Cruel, slain in 1369, and Lancaster's assumption of the title of king of Castile, caused Henry of Trastamare, who since his brother's death had occupied the throne of that kingdom, to take an active part against England. During the early part of 1372 a considerable fleet was prepared in order to reinforce the English party in Aquitaine, and by the king's command mariners were impressed through all the western counties (*ib.* p. 938). At the same time there was reason to believe that an invasion of the kingdom was imminent (*ib.* p. 942). The command of the expedition was given to the Earl of Pembroke, who was appointed the king's lieutenant in Aquitaine on 20 April (*ib.* p. 941); for Lancaster had returned to England and was now at the head of affairs, and Pembroke appears to have belonged to his party. Pembroke sailed about 10 June, intending to relieve Rochelle, which was then besieged by the French. When he arrived off the harbour he found it occupied by a considerably stronger Spanish fleet. Early on the 24th the enemy, who had the wind in their favour, surrounded his fleet, and after a fierce battle burnt his ships and made him prisoner. He was carrying twenty thousand marks to pay the troops in Guyenne, and this sum was all lost (FROISSART, i. 638; *Cont.* MURIMUTH, p. 212). Edward was much grieved when he heard of this disaster, which indeed gave the deathblow to his power in the south. Poitiers and Rochelle were shortly afterwards yielded to the French. Thouars was besieged, and the king determined to attempt its relief in person. A fresh fleet was raised, and he embarked at Sandwich with the Prince of Wales, Lancaster, and nearly the whole nobility of the realm, and sailed probably on 31 Aug. The wind was contrary, and the fleet never got far from land. By 9 Oct. the king had landed again (NICOLAS), and, though the wind changed as soon as he landed, did not re-embark, and so, it was commonly said, 900,000*l.* were wasted (WALSINGHAM, i. 315). All Poitou except a few fortresses turned to the French king, and Du Guesclin was virtually master in Saintonge and Angoumois. On 5 Oct. Edward received the prince's surrender of Aquitaine (*Fœdera*, iii. 973). This was announced to the parliament that met on the 13th; another heavy subsidy on wool was granted for two years and a fifteenth for one year to meet the king's urgent need of money for the expenses of the war, and several petitions were presented. In one of these the commons represented that, though twenty years before the king was called by all countries 'king of the sea,' the navy was now destroyed, and that principally because ships were impressed a quarter of a year or more before they set sail, and no pay was given either to mariners or owners while they remained in port waiting for orders (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 311). They further requested that no lawyers might be eligible as knights of the shire on the ground that they pressed their clients' interests in parliament instead of attending to public affairs, and that no sheriff might be returned during his term of office. While there were no doubt special reasons for these requests, as there had been for the attack on clerical ministers the year before, they prove that the burden of taxation, the ill-success of the war, and the general maladministration of affairs were causing the nation to grow restless; men were conscious that some change was necessary, and had not as yet settled in what direction it should be made. When the knights of the shire had gone home the citizens and burgesses were persuaded to make the king a grant of customs, which was clearly an unconstitutional

proceeding (*ib.* ii. 310; HALLAM, *Middle Ages*, iii. 47; STUBBS, *Const. Hist.* ii. 424).

In February 1373 a fleet was fitted out, partly composed of Genoese galleys (*Fœdera*, iii. 965, 970), and sent with a force under Salisbury to Brittany, where Du Guesclin was carrying all before him. Some Spanish ships were burnt at St. Malo, the country was ravaged, and Du Guesclin, who would not be tempted to give battle, raised the siege of Brest. On 12 June the king appointed Lancaster, who was then in full power, his captain-general in France (*ib.* p. 982), and sent him with a large army to Calais. He rode through the land without meeting any resistance and wasting the country terribly. When he reached Bordeaux his army was thinned by hunger and disease, and nearly all his horses had perished on the march, so that the splendid force with which he left Calais was utterly ruined though it had fought no battle (for details see GAUNT, JOHN OF; WALSINGHAM, i. 315). More money was needed, and was demanded of the parliament on 21 Nov. For the first time at the request of the commons certain lords held a conference with them; the grant was not made until after five days' debate, and then it was joined with a request that it should be spent only on the war (*Const. Hist.* ii. 426). A petition was also presented that the king would find a remedy for papal provisions, by which the pope obtained the first-fruits of ecclesiastical dignities and money was drawn away from the realm. To this it was answered that he had already sent ambassadors to the Roman court. On 8 Aug. of this year Edward gave all the jewels and other goods of his late queen to Alice Perrers (*Fœdera*, iii. 989). Lancaster returned to England in April 1374, and Aquitaine, with the exception of Bordeaux and Bayonne, turned to the French king (*Cont.* MURIMUTH, p. 215). Acting on the petition of the parliament of the last year, Edward on 16 April sent a writ to each of the bishops commanding them to inform him what dignities and benefices within their respective dioceses were held by foreigners. And he further sent ambassadors, one of whom was Dr. John Wycliffe (*Fœdera*, iii. 1071), to a conference Gregory had called to meet at Bruges. At this conference the pope acted as a peacemaker, and on 27 June 1375 Lancaster obtained a year's truce with France and Castile, which was afterwards prolonged and virtually lasted during the rest of the reign. Another result of the conference was an agreement between the king and the pope, dated 1 Sept., by which, though some temporary concessions were made by the pope, matters were left much as they were before (*ib.* p. 1037). The national discontent found expression in 1376. Edward was completely governed by his mistress and neglected the affairs of the kingdom, while she used her power scandalously; she interfered in lawsuits, and even sat by the judges on the bench and with the doctors in the ecclesiastical courts (*Chron. Angliæ*, p. 96). She was upheld by Lancaster, who thus secured his position as the virtual head of the government. He was selfish, ambitious, and unpopular, and was allied with a clique of courtiers who plundered the king and the nation unscrupulously. The failure of the war had been brought about by the incapacity and neglect of the government, the heavy taxes under which the country suffered were paid in vain, and the administration was thoroughly corrupt. No parliament had been summoned since November 1373. On 28 April a parliament met which received the title of the 'Good parliament' (WALSINGHAM, i. 324). Again the commons requested that certain of the magnates would confer with them. An attack, in which they were upheld by the Prince of Wales and the Bishop of Winchester, was made by the mouth of the speaker, Peter de la Mare, on the evils of the administration and especially on the abuses of the staple, the loans raised by the king, and the traffic that the court party carried on in them. The speaker impeached Lord Latimer, the king's chamberlain, and Lyons, his financial agent, of fraud and other misdemeanors; on one occasion they had raised twenty thousand marks from the merchants for the king's use and had embezzled the money. Lyons offered the king a bribe, which he received gladly, observing, 'He owes us this and much more, so he only offers us our own' (*ib.* p. 80). Edward, however, was not able and probably did not attempt to do anything either for him or Latimer, and they were condemned to imprisonment and the one to total, the other to partial, forfeiture. Sir Richard Stury was also banished from the court for making mischief between the king and the commons. When Edward found that the commons were about to proceed against his mistress, he sent a message to them begging them to deal gently with her for the sake of his love and his honour (*ib.* p. 97). She was banished from court. The death of the Prince of Wales on 8 June, though a sore blow to the commons, seems to have made them more determined; they requested that they might see his son Richard, which was meant as a check to Lancaster's ambition [see under GAUNT, JOHN OF], and before granting supply demanded that the king should accept an elected council of lords, a condition to which he gave his assent at

Eltham. A hundred and forty petitions were presented, and among them the commons prayed that parliaments might be held annually and that knights of the shire might be chosen by election and not nominated by the sheriffs. The 'Good parliament' was dismissed on 9 July. Lancaster at once regained his former power, and carried out a retrograde policy which appears to have met with the king's approval. The lords elected to reinforce the council were dismissed, and the late parliament was declared to be no parliament. Peter de la Mare was imprisoned, the temporalities of the see of Winchester were seized, and by Edward's wish Alice Perrers and the rest of those who had been banished from court returned to it. On 7 Oct. Edward, whose strength was now failing rapidly, more, it was said, from self-indulgence than from old age, made his will and appointed Lancaster and Latimer two of his executors (*Fœdera*, iii. 1080). He was then at Havering-at-Bower, Essex, where he remained until after Christmas. Lancaster so managed the elections that in the parliament that met on 27 Jan. 1377 the commons were almost wholly of his party [for details of the events of the remainder of the reign see under GAUNT, JOHN OF, and COURTENAY, WILLIAM]. He strengthened himself by an alliance with Wycliffe. The clergy struck at him by attacking his new ally. A riot was caused in London by his insolent behaviour to Bishop Courtenay. Sir Robert Ashton, the king's chamberlain, one of his party, presented the conduct of the Londoners in the worst light to the king. After some difficulty a deputation from the city obtained an audience of the king at Sheen. Edward received them graciously and his tact and courtesy allayed the tumult, but he was unable to make peace between them and the duke. Parliament restored Alice Perrers, Latimer, and Lyons, and granted a poll-tax of 4*d.* a head, which was disliked by the people generally (*Fœdera*, p. 130; WALSINGHAM, i. 323). In commemoration of the completion of the jubilee year of his reign, and at the request of parliament, Edward granted a pardon, from which, however, the Bishop of Winchester was excepted. On 15 Feb. he also published articles to which he said the pope had agreed verbally, and which contained some advance on the letters of 1 Sept. 1375; the pope gave up reservations, would not take action with respect to bishoprics until a free election had been made, would give some relief to the clergy in the matter of first-fruits, and would act moderately as to provisions and the appointment of foreigners; while the king promised to abstain from interfering with presentations to benefices (*Fœdera*, iii. 1072; *Const. Hist.* ii. 427 *n.* 2). The clergy, led by Bishop Courtenay, upheld the cause of the Bishop of Winchester, who at last obtained the restoration of his temporalities by bribing the king's mistress. Although the king, who remained at Sheen, was growing weaker, Alice Perrers encouraged him to believe that he was not dying, and he talked of nothing but hunting and hawking. On 21 June, however, his voice failed, and she then took the rings off his fingers and left him (*Chron. Angliæ*, p. 143). All his courtiers deserted him, and only a single priest attended his deathbed out of compassion. He regained his voice sufficiently to utter the words 'Jesu miserere,' kissed the cross that the priest placed in his hands, and shortly afterwards died in the sixty-fifth year of his age and the fifty-first of his reign. He was buried in Westminster Abbey, near the body of his queen Philippa. Besides his works at Windsor he founded the Cistercian abbey of St. Mary Graces or Eastminster, near East Smithfield (*Monasticon*, v. 717), a nunnery at Dartford in Kent (*ib.* vi. 537), King's Hall at Cambridge, and a church and hospital at Calais (BARNES, p. 910). He had twelve children, whose effigies appear on his tomb: Edward, prince of Wales; Lionel, duke of Clarence; John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster; Edmund of Langley, earl of Cambridge, and afterwards duke of York; Thomas of Woodstock, afterwards earl of Buckingham and duke of Gloucester; and two sons, both named William, who died in infancy; and five daughters: Isabella, married to Ingelram de Couci; Joan, betrothed to Pedro of Aragon, but died in 1348; Mary, married to John of Montfort, duke of Britanny; Margaret, betrothed to John Hastings, earl of Pembroke, but died unmarried; and Blanche, died in infancy. Edward is also said to have had a bastard son, Nicholas Litlington, abbot of Westminster from 1362 to 1386 (BARNES, p. 910; DUGDALE, *Monasticon*, i. 275).

[Joshua Barnes's Life of Edward III, a learned work, contains some information from an unprinted C. C. C. MS. 1688; Longman's Life and Times of Edward III, interesting, though weak in constitutional history; Warburton's Edward III, Epochs of Modern History. For constitutional history the modern authorities are Hallam's Middle Ages, ed. 1860; and Stubbs's Const. Hist. vol. ii. For early years consult Ann. Paulini, and Bridlington, in Chronicles of Edw. I and Edw. II (Rolls Ser.), and W. Dene, Anglia Sacra, vol. i. For general history, Murimuth with continuation, and Hemingburgh (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Knighton, ed. Twysden; Chron. Gal. le Baker, ed. Giles; Stow's Annales; Walsingham (Rolls Ser.); Eulogium (Rolls Ser.); Political Songs

(Rolls Ser.); Rolls of Parliament, vol. ii.; Rymer's Fœdera, II. ii. III. i. ii. Record ed. For last years, Chronicon Angliæ (Rolls Ser.) For ecclesiastical history, Wilkins's Concilia, vols. ii. and iii.; Raynaldi, Ann. Eccles. sub ann.; Birchington's Anglia Sacra, vol. i.; Collier's Ecclesiastical Hist. vol. iii. For the French wars, Chroniques de Jehan le Bel, ed. Polain (Académie Impériale); and also for much besides Chronique de Froissart, ed. Luce, vols. i–viii., Société de l'Histoire de France, and ed. Buchon, Panthéon Littéraire; Gulielmus de Nangiaco, Société de l'Histoire; Mémoires de Bertrand du Guesclin, Panthéon Litt.; Delepierre's Jean le Klerk, Edouard III en Belgique; Robert of Avesbury, ed. Hearne, especially valuable for the letters he preserves; Istorie Pistolesi, Gio. Villani, and Matteo Villani in vols. xi. xiii. and xiv. respectively of Muratori's Rerum Ital. Scriptores; Baron Seymour de Constant's Bataille de Crécy, ed. 1846; F. C. Louandre's Histoire d'Abbeville; Archæologia, xxviii. 171, xxxii. 383; H. Brackenbury's Ancient Cannon in Europe, pt. i.; Martin's Histoire de France, vol. v. For Scottish affairs, Fordun's Scotichronicon, ed. Hearne; Lord Hailes's Annals; Tytler's Hist. of Scotland, vol. i.; Froissart, and English authorities. See also Rogers's Hist. of Prices, and arts. on 'Black Death' in Fortnightly Rev. ii. and iii., by Mr. Frederic Seebohm and Prof. J. E. T. Rogers; Sir H. Nicolas's Royal Navy, Chronology of History, and Orders of Knighthood; Ashmole's Order of the Garter.] W. H.

EDWARD IV (1442–1483), king of England, was the son of Richard, duke of York, by his wife Cecily Nevill, daughter of the first Earl of Westmorland. His father was descended from Edward III by both parents, being the lineal representative both of Lionel, duke of Clarence, Edward's third son, and of Edmund, duke of York, his fifth. The rival house of Lancaster, on the other hand, were descended from John of Gaunt, the fourth son; but Lionel, duke of Clarence, though an elder brother, left no male issue, and his great-grandson, Edmund Mortimer, was a mere infant when Henry IV usurped the throne. Nor does it appear that in after years this Edmund himself showed any disposition to vindicate his right; but early in the reign of Henry V a conspiracy was formed in his behalf by his cousin Richard, earl of Cambridge, who had married his sister and was himself the son of the before-mentioned Edmund, duke of York. The plot was detected just before Henry V crossed the sea, in his first invasion of France; the Earl of Cambridge confessed and was beheaded, and nothing was heard for upwards of forty years of any further attempt to challenge the right of the house of Lancaster.

Richard duke of York, the father of Edward IV, was the son of this Richard, earl of Cambridge, by his wife, Anne Mortimer. Cecily, the wife of Richard, duke of York, bore him no less than eight sons and four daughters within the space of sixteen years, of whom the eldest was Anne, afterwards duchess of Exeter, born at Fotheringay in 1439. Then came Henry, who did not live long, and then Edward, afterwards Edward IV, born at Rouen, as we are minutely told, at two o'clock in the morning of Monday, 28 April 1442. As 28 April in that year was a Saturday, not a Monday, there is some error. At the age of twelve, when bearing the title of the Earl of March, he and his brother Edmund, called Earl of Rutland, who was a year his junior, wrote two joint letters to their father from Ludlow, the first dated Saturday in Easter week, the second on 3 June. In the first they thank him for 'our green gowns now sent unto us to our great comfort; beseeching your good lordship to remember our porteux [i.e. breviary], and that we might have some fine bonnets sent unto us by the next sure messenger, for necessity so requireth.' In the other, taking note of a paternal admonition, 'to attend specially to our learning in our young age that should cause us to grow to honour and worship in our old age,' they assure their father that they have been diligent in their studies ever since coming to Ludlow (*Ellis Letters*, 1st ser. i. 9; *Paston Letters*, new ed. vol. i. Introd. p. cxi).

This was in the year before the first actual outbreak of the civil war, which is considered to have begun with the battle of St. Albans. But at the very commencement of the year it was expected that the boy Edward would leave his studies and come up to London with his father, at the head of a separate company of armed men. Next year, by one account, he actually accompanied his father to the battle of St. Albans, or at least towards the council summoned to meet at Leicester just before (*Three Fifteenth-century Chronicles*, pp. 151–2). But it seems clear that he was not in the battle, of which one rather minute report has come down to us; and if he went as far as Leicester, he probably returned to Ludlow. At all events, we hear nothing more of him till four years later (12 Oct. 1459), when there was a great muster of the Duke of York's adherents at that very place, the duke himself at their head. But when the king's army lay encamped opposite the Yorkists, the latter were deserted by a large body under Sir Andrew Trollope, and found it impossible to maintain the fight. The Duke of York and his second son Rutland fled first to Wales and then to Ireland, while Edward, his eldest, along with the Earls of

Salisbury and Warwick, withdrew into Devonshire, and then sailed, first to Guernsey and afterwards to Calais. Then a parliament was held at Coventry in November, at which all the leading Yorkists were attainted, and among them Edward, earl of March by name, as having been arrayed against the king (*Rolls of Parl.* v. 348–9).

The Earl of Warwick, however, being governor of Calais, and having also command of the fleet, held a strong position, from which he and his allies, March and Salisbury, could invade England; so that every one looked for their return. A mutilated letter of the time says it was expected that Edward would claim by inheritance the earldom of Ha .... (*Paston Letters*, i. 497). It is difficult to fill up the name or to think of any earldom other than that of March to which he could lay reasonable claim. But the important fact was, that he and the two other earls were there at Calais and could not be dislodged, while Warwick, having command of the sea, could communicate with the Duke of York in Ireland. In vain did the government in England supersede Warwick in the command of Calais and of the fleet, the Duke of Somerset being appointed to the one office and Lord Rivers to the other. The lords refused Somerset admission into the town, and some vessels were collected at Sandwich to aid in reducing it. Lord Rivers and his son, Sir Anthony Woodville, were apparently to have conducted the squadron across the Channel. But John Dynham, a Devonshire squire, crossed the sea at night, and arriving at Sandwich between four and five on a dark winter morning, soon after Christmas, seized Lord Rivers in his bed, won the town, took the best ships lying in the harbour, and carried Rivers and his son across to Calais.

'My Lord Rivers,' as a contemporary letter says, 'was brought to Calais, and before the lords, with eight score torches; and there my lord of Salisbury rated him, calling him knave's son that he should be so rude to call him and these other lords traitors, for they should be found the king's true liegemen when he should be found a traitor. And my lord of Warwick rated him, and said that his father was but a squire. . . . And my lord of March rated him in like wise.' My lord of March was then scolding his future father-in-law!

The command of the fleet was then given to the Duke of Exeter, who fared little better than his predecessor, being driven back into port by Warwick's men-of-war. Every attempt against the three earls was frustrated, and friends in large numbers came over from England to join them. At length Warwick, having sailed to Ireland and arranged measures in concert with the Duke of York, returned to Calais; and in June 1460 the three earls crossed the sea again to England. In their company went Francesco Coppini, bishop of Terni, a papal nuncio who had been in England the preceding year. Owing to the dissensions there, his mission had been a failure, but having reached Calais on his return he was induced by Warwick to remain there, and he became so complete a partisan of the three earls as to go back to England in their company, displaying the banner of the church (Pii II *Commentarii a Gobellino*, 161, ed. Rome, 1584). He was persuaded that their intentions were entirely loyal. So the three earls landed at Sandwich, as it were, with the blessing of the church; and Archbishop Bourchier, who met them on landing, conducted them to London with his cross borne before him.

They reached the capital on 2 July, and, notwithstanding the opposition of a small minority, the city opened its gates to them. After a brief stay they advanced towards the king, whose army they found drawn up in a valley beside Northampton. The king was in the camp, but the real commander seems to have been the Duke of Buckingham. The three earls occupied a hill from which they could see almost all that was passing. They sent a message to know whether the king and his advisers would quit the field or fight; to which Buckingham replied disdainfully that he could not leave without fighting. After a two or three hours' combat the royal army was defeated, the Duke of Buckingham slain, and the king himself taken prisoner, whom the earls conducted up to London with much outward respect and lodged in his palace of Westminster. The government was now conducted by the earls in the king's name; and a parliament was summoned to meet at Westminster on 7 Oct. The Duke of York was expected over from Ireland, and he had actually crossed the Irish Channel by the middle of September. The duke, as we read in a letter of the time, 'had divers strange commissions from the king to sit in divers towns' on his way up to London; and it was not till 10 Oct. that he arrived there. And now, laying aside his former moderation, he at once made it manifest that he aimed at the deposition of the king.

He took up his quarters in the royal palace, which he entered sword in hand. On the 16th he challenged the crown in parliament as rightfully his own. The lords were intimidated, and many stayed away. A compromise was finally agreed to on both sides

that Henry should retain the crown for life, the succession being reserved to the duke and his heirs immediately after him. And so it was accordingly enacted, the duke and his two eldest sons swearing fealty to Henry so long as he should live. The duke then with his second son, the Earl of Rutland, withdrew into the north to keep Christmas at his castle of Sandal, while Edward returned to the borders of Wales and kept his Christmas at the Friars at Shrewsbury. But the parliamentary settlement was not respected by Queen Margaret and her adherents, who on 30 Dec. defeated and slew the Duke of York at Wakefield; then with a host of rough northern followers advanced towards London, ravaging the country frightfully upon the way. Young Edward, who was then at Gloucester, hearing of this disaster, at once raised a body of thirty thousand men upon the borders of Wales, and would have gone immediately to meet the queen's forces, but he was informed that the Earl of Wiltshire, with Jasper Tudor, earl of Pembroke, the king's half-brother, had arrived in Wales by sea with a body of Frenchmen, Bretons, and Irishmen, who were ready to fall upon his rear. So he turned and gave them battle at Mortimer's Cross in Herefordshire, where he completely defeated them and put them to flight on 2 Feb. 1461. In the morning, just before the battle, he is said to have been encouraged by what he interpreted as a happy omen. The sun appeared to be like three suns which ultimately joined together in one. After the victory he pushed on to London, where when he arrived he was received as a deliverer. For Margaret and her northern bands having meanwhile won the second battle of St. Albans (17 Feb.), she had thereby recovered her husband, and as it was clear no mercy could be expected even by those who had upheld the parliamentary settlement, the city was divided between fear and hatred. Emissaries of the queen came to demand a contribution of money and provisions for her army. They were not allowed entrance into the city, and when the mayor had laden some carts with the required supplies, the people took the carts and divided the provisions and money among themselves.

Edward arrived in London 26 Feb., the ninth day after the battle of St. Albans, having been joined on the way up by the Earl of Warwick at Burford in Oxfordshire. He and the earl together had forty thousand men along with them, and all classes of the community welcomed them with delight. For a few days he took up his abode in the Bishop of London's palace, and numbers of the gentry of the south and east of England came up to show their devotion to him. On Sunday, 1 March, George Nevill, bishop of Exeter, who had been appointed lord chancellor by the Yorkists shortly after the battle of Northampton, addressed a large meeting at Clerkenwell, composed partly of the citizens and partly of Edward's soldiers, declaring how Edward might rightly claim the crown. On 3 March a great council was called at Baynard's Castle, a mansion which had belonged to the Duke of York, and it was agreed that Edward was now the rightful king, Henry having forfeited his claim by breach of the late parliamentary settlement. On the 4th Edward entered Westminster Hall, seated himself on the royal throne, and declared his title to the people with his own mouth. The people were then asked if they would accept him, and there was a general cry of 'Yea! yea!' after which he entered the abbey and offered at St. Edward's shrine. Next day proclamations were issued in his name as king.

Meanwhile Queen Margaret had withdrawn with her husband back into the north. Thither Edward determined to pursue them without loss of time, and he left the city on 13 March, accompanied by the Duke of Norfolk. The Earl of Warwick had already left for the north in advance of him, on Saturday the 7th, and the main body of Edward's own infantry on Wednesday the 11th. The united forces, to which the city gladly contributed a company, were no doubt enormous, though the arithmetic of the time cannot be relied on as to their numbers. Having reached Pomfret their advanced guard took, after a six hours' skirmish, the passage of the Aire at Ferrybridge, which Lord Fitzwalter was appointed to keep. Henry and Queen Margaret had thrown themselves into York, but a force under the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Northumberland, and Lord Clifford crossed the Wharfe, and early in the morning of Saturday 28 March a detachment under Lord Clifford retook the bridge at Ferrybridge by surprise, and killed Lord Fitzwalter. Lord Falconbridge, however, forced a passage at Castleford, a few miles up the river; and Clifford, to avoid being surrounded, endeavoured to fall back upon the main body of the army under Somerset, but was slain by an arrow in the throat. Next day, Palm Sunday, took place the bloody battle of Towton, in which the Lancastrians were utterly defeated. It is not easy to credit the contemporary statement that twenty-eight thousand dead were actually counted by the heralds upon the field; but unquestionably the slaughter was tremendous, the fight being obstinately maintained for no less than ten hours. The snow which fell during the action and helped to

defeat the Lancastrians, being driven by the wind in their faces, was dyed crimson as it lay. The Wharfe and its tributaries were also coloured with blood. The dead lay unburied for two or three days over a space six miles in length by nearly half a mile broad.

This great victory secured Edward in the possession of the throne. Henry and Margaret were driven to seek refuge in Scotland, and Edward, after keeping Easter at York, returned to London to be crowned. His two brothers, George and Richard, whom the Duchess of York after her husband's death had sent over to Utrecht for safety, came back and were created dukes with the titles of Clarence and Gloucester at the coronation, which took place on 28 June; and a parliament having been summoned to meet on 4 Nov., Henry VI and all his adherents were attainted as traitors.

For some years Edward was by no means securely seated. Henry and his queen obtained the aid of the Scots by putting them in possession of Berwick, and Margaret crossing to France gained also that of Louis XI by a pledge to surrender Calais. She returned to Scotland, and for a time obtained possession of the castles of Bamborough, Dunstanborough, and Alnwick. Edward, who during those early years was constantly upon the move, going from one part of his kingdom to another, left London at the beginning of November 1462, was at York on the 25th, and had reached Durham in December, when on Christmas eve the two former strongholds surrendered. Alnwick held out till 6 Jan. following (1463), when it too capitulated, and Edward was left for the moment master of all England and Wales, with the exception of Margaret's last stronghold in the latter country, Harlech Castle.

He would have pursued his enemies into Scotland and made war against the Scots, who had perfidiously broken a truce, but he was prevented by an illness brought on by youthful debauchery, and withdrew southwards, on which the Scots, about the time of Lent, again invaded England and retook Bamborough. Alnwick also was betrayed by Sir Ralph Grey, the constable, who took the captain, Sir John Ashley, prisoner and delivered him to Queen Margaret. Dunstanborough appears likewise to have been recovered by the Scots, who, however, laid siege to Norham unsuccessfully, and were put to flight by Warwick and Lord Montague. Margaret, sailing from Bamborough (where she left her husband behind her) in April, escaped abroad once more. Edward, on the other hand, prorogued in June a parliament which had met at Westminster in the end of April, in order to enable him to go in person against the Scots, who, in concert with English rebels, were continually molesting the kingdom (*Rolls of Parl.* v. 498). Great preparations appear to have been made for an army to march northward, and a fleet, which was put under command of the Earl of Worcester, but nothing came of them. Edward did indeed march northwards; he had got to Northampton in July, and as far as York by December, but he appears to have advanced no further, and at York in December he saw nothing better to do than to agree to a new truce with Scotland till the end of October following (Rymer, xi. 510).

The Northumbrian castles were still in Lancastrian hands, but Edward seems to have believed that without the aid of the Scots his enemies could do nothing against him, and he allowed himself to be lulled into a state of false security which was truly marvellous. One ground of his confidence seems to have been the belief that he had conciliated and won over to his side the young Duke of Somerset, whose father had been his own father's chief opponent. Somerset accompanied him on his progress towards the north, much to the indignation of the people of Northamptonshire, who had been devoted to the Duke of York and would have killed the head of the rival house within the king's own palace but for Edward's special intervention. And not only did Edward save his life and soothe his own followers by fair speeches, giving them also a tun of wine to drink and make merry with at Northampton, but he sent the duke secretly to one of his castles in Wales for security, and his men to Newcastle to help to garrison the town, giving them good wages at his own expense. But about Christmas the duke stole out of Wales with a small company towards Newcastle, which he and his men had arranged to betray to the enemy. His movements were discovered, and he was very nearly taken in his bed in the neighbourhood of Durham, but he managed to escape barefooted in his shirt.

Edward did not even yet bestir himself to meet the coming danger. He 'sent a great fellowship of his household men to keep the town of Newcastle, and made the Lord Scrope of Bolton captain of the town,' which he kept safe for the remainder of the winter. But he himself, after returning to London, spent the time in feasting with his lords, trusting to make a permanent peace with Scotland, for which the Scots themselves sued about Easter 1464, and commissioners were appointed on both sides to meet at York, when news reached him that the Lancastrians had gained

possession not only of Norham Castle, but also of the castle of Skipton in Craven. He saw now that he must bestir himself, and began to move northwards again. Meanwhile, further events were taking place in Northumberland. Lord Montague, being assigned to meet the Scotch ambassadors on the frontier and conduct them to York, proceeded first to Newcastle, where he escaped an ambush laid for him on the way by the Duke of Somerset; and then collecting a considerable body of men for safety went on towards Norham. He was met at Hedgley Moor on St. Mark's day, 25 April, by the Duke of Somerset, Sir Ralph Percy, Lord Hungerford, and others, with a force of five thousand men, which he completely defeated. He then passed on to Norham, which apparently he regained for Edward, and, receiving the Scotch ambassadors there, conducted them to Newcastle. Here, however, he had not rested long when he was compelled to advance towards Hexham, where he met King Henry himself, who from Bamborough had rejoined his defeated followers Somerset, lords Roos and Hungerford, and others—in short, the whole power of the Lancastrian party in the north of England. Lord Montague was again victorious. Somerset, Hungerford, and most of the other leaders were taken, and King Henry saved himself by flight. The principal prisoners were beheaded, some next day at Hexham, others three days after the battle at Newcastle, and the fourth day at Middleham; others, again, towards the end of the month at York. The cause of the house of Lancaster was completely crushed; and in the course of the summer Alnwick, Dunstanborough, and Bamborough again came under Edward's power.

Edward had contributed nothing personally to this result. He had, indeed, left London towards the end of April, and had reached Stony Stratford by the 30th; but his mind was not even then much bent on war. He stole off early next morning (1 May) to pay a secret visit to Grafton, the residence of the old Duchess of Bedford, widow of the regent who had governed France in the early years of Henry VI. This lady, after Bedford's death, had married a second husband, Richard Woodville, lord Rivers, by whom she had a grown-up daughter, Elizabeth, now the widow of Sir John Grey of Groby. Edward had already been much fascinated with the charms of this young widow, and though he stayed on this occasion a very brief time with her, returning in a few hours to Stony Stratford, he was privately married to her that day before he left Grafton; soon after which he went on to York, as if nothing particular had occurred to him, and created Montague Earl of Northumberland.

The marriage was carefully kept secret for some time. Matches had already been suggested for him in various quarters. Isabella, princess of Castile, afterwards queen and joint ruler with Ferdinand of Aragon, might have been his bride; and at this very time his council were inclined to favour a match with Bona of Savoy, sister-in-law of Louis XI of France. The chief promoter of this match was his powerful supporter the Earl of Warwick, who was expected in France in the course of the year to arrange it. Not only would Warwick be disgusted by the failure of the match, but Warwick's policy, which was to make a cordial alliance with France and Burgundy, would probably be disconcerted. A truce with France had already been arranged in April to last till October, and a diet was meanwhile to take place at St. Omer's, with a view to a more lasting peace (Rymer, 1st ed. xi. 518, 520, 521). The secret must be disclosed before Warwick went abroad to negotiate the match with Bona; and about Michaelmas at Reading Edward informed his council that he was already a married man (W. Wyrcester; see also foot-notes in Kirk, *Charles the Bold*, i. 415, ii. 15).

Warwick was offended, and many of the nobility shared his feelings. The mission of Warwick to France was broken off, and there was some uncertainty at first how far Louis would be inclined towards peace. The peers summoned to the council at Reading held consultations among themselves whether the marriage could not be annulled (*Ven. Cal.* i. No. 395). But Warwick concealed his resentment, and Louis had difficulties to contend with in his own kingdom which made it unadvisable to attempt immediately to raise up trouble for Edward. Meanwhile the disaffection was increased by the honours showered upon the new queen's relations. Her father, a simple baron, was raised to the dignity of Earl Rivers. Her brother Anthony had already married a wealthy heiress, and thereby won the title of Lord Scales; but another brother, five sisters, and her son by her first husband, Thomas Grey, were all married to members of great and wealthy houses. Leading offices of state were also engrossed by the upstarts in a way that did not tend to relieve their unpopularity.

Edward in fact did not shirk or endeavour in any way to lessen the consequences of what he had done. On Whitsunday, 26 May 1465, he caused his queen to be crowned at Westminster. She seems to have borne him three daughters before the birth of their eldest son,

who was only born in the seventh year of their married life; and the absence of male issue no doubt helped to strengthen the combination which drove him for a time into exile. Meanwhile fortune seemed to favour his cause. About the end of June 1465 Henry VI was taken in Lancashire, and being brought up to London in July was lodged safely in the Tower. Warwick's policy also was thwarted; for though Edward sent him to France in embassy in the spring of 1467, and he did his utmost to promote a cordial alliance, for the sake of which Louis was willing to have made large concessions, the French offers were not only rejected with disdain, but Edward showed himself bent rather on cultivating the friendship of France's dangerous rival Burgundy.

It was in honour of this alliance that the famous tournament took place in Smithfield in June 1467 between Lord Scales and the Bastard of Burgundy. About the same time Philip, duke of Burgundy, died at Bruges, and his son Charles, count of Charolois, already affianced to Edward's sister Margaret, became duke in his place. Warwick was at that very time in France, and on his return brought with him an embassy from Louis to England; but he found that his brother, the Archbishop of York, had meanwhile been deprived of the great seal, and that Edward was less inclined to a French alliance than ever. He had been cultivating alliances all over Europe, except with the old traditional enemy of England, and the idea of revindicating English claims on France was still popular.

In May 1468 Edward declared to parliament his intention of invading France in person, and obtained a grant of two fifteenths and two tenths, with a view to a future expedition (*Rolls of Parl.* v. 622–3). The marriage of his sister Margaret to Charles the Bold of Burgundy took place near Bruges in July following. Warwick, who had held his own correspondence with Louis XI for the purpose of thwarting Edward's policy, disliked both the match and the alliance which it was to cement; but he dissembled his feelings, and conducted Margaret to the seaside on her way to the Low Countries. The French king was secretly encouraging Margaret of Anjou, and many arrests were made in England of persons accused of conveying or receiving messages from her. In June Jasper Tudor, the attainted earl of Pembroke, half-brother to Henry VI, landed at Harlech in Wales, a castle which alone at this time held out for the house of Lancaster, and succeeded for a while in reducing some of the neighbouring country, where he held sessions and assizes in King Henry's name; but he was very soon driven out by Lord Herbert, whom Edward rewarded by creating him Earl of Pembroke, the better to discredit Jasper's title.

Warwick, too, was actively intriguing against Edward in his own kingdom. He had already, apparently soon after the announcement of the king's marriage, held a conference with the king's two brothers at Cambridge, in which he made them many promises calculated to shake their allegiance. He offered the Duke of Clarence the hand of his eldest daughter, with the prospect of inheriting at least one half of his vast possessions. The duke at once accepted, and though he at first denied his engagement when Edward charged him with it, replied in answer to further remonstrances that even if he had made such a contract it was not a bad one. From this time his relations with the king were uncomfortable, and he was more and more in Warwick's confidence. He was still further confirmed in this by Edward's incivility to Warwick and the embassy that came with him from Louis XI. It was noted that he alone went to meet the ambassadors on their arrival; and when Edward, after admitting them to one formal interview, withdrew to Windsor, he and Warwick were the only persons with whom they had any opportunity to negotiate. Warwick accordingly showed the Frenchmen that the king was governed by traitors, as he called them, quite opposed to the interests of France, and that they must concert measures of vengeance together against him.

At the same time he promised Clarence to make him king, or at least the real ruler of all England. Clarence willingly trusted him, and Warwick, after the French embassy had left, conspired with his brother, the Archbishop of York, to raise up insurrections in the north at a word from him. A commotion accordingly broke out in Yorkshire in June 1469, which is known as Robin of Redesdale's insurrection, from the name assumed by its leader, Sir William Conyers. The insurgents published manifestos everywhere, complaining of the too great influence exercised by the queen's relations. Warwick was then at Calais, of which he was still governor. To him Clarence crossed the sea, and on 11 July the marriage between the duke and the earl's daughter was celebrated, while England was convulsed with a rebellion which might be called a renewal of civil war. The king went northwards to meet the insurgents, and sent a message to his brother, to Warwick, and to the archbishop to come to his aid. The new Earl of Pembroke, with

a strong force levied in Wales, met the rebels at Edgecote, near Banbury, and was defeated, 26 July, with great slaughter. He and his brother, Sir Richard Herbert, were taken prisoners and brought to Northampton, where they were beheaded. The king himself was taken by the Archbishop of York near Coventry, and brought first to the town of Warwick and afterwards to Middleham. Earl Rivers and his son, Sir John Woodville, were also taken by the rebels and put to death at Coventry.

Clarence, Warwick, and the Archbishop of York had left Calais and come over to England on the king's summons. They issued a proclamation on 12 July, couched in the ordinary language of revolted subjects, as if their only object was to be a medium with the king to redress the grievances of his people. This pretence they found it still advisable to keep up, for the city of London was devoted to Edward's interests, and the Duke of Burgundy had written to the lord mayor to confirm their loyalty and promise aid if needful. Warwick, therefore, judged it best to release his prisoner, whom, indeed, he had not kept in very close confinement, allowing him freely to hunt, though with keepers beside him. He accordingly proposed to the king that he should go up to London, see the queen, his wife, and show himself to the people; and he wrote to the Londoners that the king was going to pay them a visit, and that they should see there was no truth in the report that he had been made a prisoner. Edward was glad to condone the past. He came up to London, and though he bade the Archbishop of York remain behind till sent for at his palace of the Moor in Hertfordshire, he spoke not only of him but of Warwick and Clarence also as his very good friends.

Warwick and Clarence received a general pardon before Christmas for all their past offences. Edward's confidence in his brother at least appears to have returned; and it was confirmed when in the beginning of March 1470, on the breaking out of a new insurrection in Lincolnshire, Clarence sent to offer him his service and that of the Earl of Warwick to put it down. This new outbreak was a movement avowedly in behalf of King Henry, headed by Sir Robert Welles, the eldest son of Lord Welles; it had been carefully organised by Warwick and Clarence beforehand, and had been purposely deferred till they had left the king and retired into Warwickshire. They had now intimated to the rebels that they would come from the west and join them; yet Edward was slow to believe their treason. Fortunately for him Warwick and Clarence failed to make good their promise when he came upon the insurgents at Stamford and utterly routed them in the battle of Losecoat Field. Sir Robert Welles was put to death after the battle, and before he suffered made a full confession, by which it appeared that he was merely the instrument of Clarence and Warwick's perfidy.

On this revelation Edward summoned the duke and earl to come to him and clear themselves, but they withdrew into Lancashire, endeavouring still to raise the north of England against the king. Edward could not pursue them through the barren country intervening, but pushed northwards to York, where several insurgent leaders came in and submitted to him; then issued a proclamation dated 24 March allowing the duke and earl still four days to come to him and clear themselves. The four days expired, and Edward, who finding Yorkshire submissive was now returning southwards, proclaimed them traitors at Nottingham on the 31st. They now prepared for flight, and, taking their wives along with them, embarked somewhere on the west coast for Calais, where they expected to be secure. Edward had anticipated this movement, and had warned the Lord Wenlock, the earl's lieutenant there, not to let him enter the town; and though he fired a few shots he found it was hopeless to force an entry, as the Duke of Burgundy, being notified of the situation, was coming to the rescue. Warwick then cruised about the channel and captured a number of vessels. In the end he and Clarence sailed to Normandy and landed at Honfleur, where they left their vessels and repaired to the king of France at Angers. And here occurred one of the strangest negotiations in all history.

Warwick, Clarence, Margaret of Anjou, and her son, Prince Edward, were all equally opposed to Edward IV, but they had been no less enemies to each other; and Margaret particularly looked upon Warwick as the cause of all her misfortunes. Nevertheless Louis contrived to bring them together at Angers and reconcile them with a view to united action against their common enemy. In the end Margaret was not only induced to pardon Warwick, but to seal the matter with a compact for the marriage of her son to the earl's second daughter on condition that Warwick should in the first place invade England and recover the kingdom for Henry VI. Assisted by Louis he and Clarence crossed the Channel (a convenient storm having dispersed the Burgundian fleet) and landed a force in the ports of Plymouth and Dartmouth shortly before Michaelmas.

Edward was then in Yorkshire, having been drawn thither to put down a new rebellion under Lord Fitzhugh, who fled to Scotland on his approach. He had heard of the proposed enterprise at York as early as 7 Sept., and the news of the accomplished landing reached him towards the end of the month at Doncaster. But among those who raised troops, and no further off than Pomfret, was Warwick's brother Montague, whom he had created Earl of Northumberland in 1464. This nobleman, notwithstanding his brother's defection, had preserved his allegiance till now. But unfortunately Edward had lately persuaded him to resign the earldom of Northumberland in favour of the heir of the Percys, whose attainder he intended to reverse, and had promoted him instead to the dignity of a marquis with his old title of Montague. This was really more of a burden than a compensation, seeing that, as he himself said, the king had given him but 'a pye's-nest to maintain his estate with.' So, having raised six thousand men, as if for King Edward's service, and advanced to within six or seven miles of the king, he informed his followers that he had now changed masters, and a cry of 'King Henry!' rose from all his host. A faithful servant of Edward's galloped in hot haste to warn him. He found him, by one account, in bed; by another, sitting at dinner. The king had to fly. Accompanied by his brother Gloucester, his brother-in-law Rivers, his devoted friend and chamberlain Lord Hastings, and about eight hundred men, he escaped to Lynn, where they found shipping, 29 Sept., to convey them to Holland. So precipitate had been their flight that they had no clothes except those they wore, and they landed at Alkmaar in a state of great destitution, after escaping some dangers at sea from the Easterlings, who were then at war both with the English and the French.

Louis de Bruges, Lord de la Grutuyse, who was governor for the Duke of Burgundy in Holland, at once succoured them, and paid their expenses until he had conducted them to the Hague, where they arrived 11 Oct. He also sent on the news to the Duke of Burgundy, who, having in vain sent Edward repeated warnings beforehand of Warwick's projected invasion, would now, according to Commines, have been better pleased to hear of his death, for even to shelter Edward, under present circumstances, exposed him to the resentment of an old enemy who had become all at once undisputed master of England. There were also refugees of the house of Lancaster at his court, and these strongly urged him not to give any succour to the exiled king. He visited Edward, however, at Aire on 2 Jan. 1471, and the latter also came to his court at St. Pol; but he protested publicly he would give him no kind of assistance to recover his throne.

Edward had even left behind him in England his wife and children. They seemed to be secure in the Tower of London when he went northwards, but Elizabeth, when she heard that he had escaped abroad, withdrew secretly with her children into the sanctuary at Westminster, where she gave birth to a son, afterwards Edward V. Meanwhile Henry VI was released from prison and proclaimed king once more. In a short time Margaret of Anjou and her son were expected to rejoin him in England. The Duke of Burgundy, however, yielded privately to Edward's entreaties, sent him underhand a sum of fifty thousand florins, and placed at his disposal three or four great ships which he got ready for him at Veere in Holland, and secretly hired for him fourteen Easterling vessels besides to transport him into England.

He accordingly embarked at Flushing on 2 March 1471 with his brother Gloucester, Earl Rivers, and some twelve thousand fighting men. Kept back for some days by contrary winds, he arrived before Cromer in Norfolk 12 March, where he caused Sir Robert Chamberlain, Sir Gilbert Debenham, and others to land and ascertain how the people of those parts were affected towards his return. Finding that the district was quite under the power of Warwick and the Earl of Oxford, he sailed further north, and during the next two days met with violent storms which compelled the whole expedition to land in different places near the Humber. He himself landed 14 March at Ravenspur, the spot, now swallowed up by the North Sea, where Henry IV had landed before him. His brother disembarked four miles and Rivers fourteen miles from him, but they and all their companies met next day. The people declined at first to join him, and musters were made in some places to resist him; but following once more the precedent of Henry IV, he gave out that he only came to claim his dukedom of York, and not the crown. He even caused his men to cry 'King Henry and Prince Edward!' as they passed along, making them wear the prince's badge of the ostrich feather, and exhibited a letter from Percy, the restored Earl of Northumberland, who, grateful for his restoration, seems heartily to have entered into the scheme, to indicate that he came upon summons.

On consultation with his friends it was determined first to go to York, where he arrived on the 18th. The recorder, Thomas

Conyers, met him three miles from the city and endeavoured to dissuade him from attempting to enter it. But as Conyers was suspected to be no sympathiser he went on and had a friendly reception. Next day he and his company went to Tadcaster, 'a town of the Earl of Northumberland's,' ten miles south of York, from which they proceeded to Wakefield and his father's seat at Sandal. The Marquis Montague, who lay in Pomfret Castle, seems to have thought it prudent not to molest his passage, and the influence of the Earl of Northumberland prevented men from stirring, although the earl himself forbore to take open part with him. Few men, however, actually joined him, even about Wakefield, where his father's influence was greatest, till he had passed Doncaster and come to Nottingham. Here Sir William Parr and Sir James Harington came to him with two good bands of men to the number of six hundred. Here also, being informed that the Duke of Exeter, the Earl of Oxford, and others had gathered their forces at Newark, he turned to meet them, but they fled. He pursued his journey southwards to Leicester, where his friend Lord Hastings's influence brought an accession to his forces of three thousand men.

Here the Earl of Warwick could have attacked him, but he was now in the midst of friends, and people could not be raised against him in sufficient numbers. The earl was also dissuaded by a letter from the Duke of Clarence, whose counsel under the circumstances seemed only prudent. So he retired and shut himself up in Coventry, whither he was pursued, 29 March, by Edward, who for three days challenged him to come out and decide the quarrel with him in the open field. As the earl did not accept the invitation, Edward went on to the town of Warwick, where he was received as king, and issued proclamations as such. He also offered the earl a free pardon if he would submit, but this was not accepted either. He had better hopes, however, of winning over his brother Clarence, who had secretly promised him when they were both in exile that he would desert Warwick and come to his support on his return to England. A lady passing into France from the Duke of Burgundy had carried letters to the Duchess of Clarence as if to promote a general agreement between France, Burgundy, and the house of Lancaster, but having gained access thereby, not merely to the Duchess but to the Duke of Clarence, she pointed out to him that the course he was then pursuing, besides being ruinous to his family, was utterly against his own interests.

Edward accordingly with seven thousand men issued one day three miles out of Warwick, on the road to Banbury, and saw his brother Clarence advancing to meet him at the head of a company of soldiers. When the two hosts stood face to face within half a mile of each other, Edward, accompanied by his brother Gloucester, Rivers, Hastings, and a few others, advanced towards the opposite lines, while Clarence, likewise with a select company, came out to meet him. A personal reconciliation took place, and then the two armies joined and went together to Warwick. Clarence then made some efforts, but without success, to get Warwick also to come to terms with his brother. The earl had gone too far to recede; and he was now joined by the Duke of Exeter, the Marquis Montague, the Earl of Oxford, and hosts of followers. Edward accordingly removed from Warwick towards London on Friday, 5 April; spent the Saturday and Sunday (which was Palm Sunday) at Daventry, where he duly attended the services of the day, and a very encouraging miracle was said to have been witnessed as he knelt before an image of St. Anne; and from that went to Northampton. The Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Devonshire, and others of his opponents had left London for the west, where Margaret and her son were expected to land, to strengthen them on their arrival. He arrived in London on Thursday, 11 April, his cause being so dear to the citizens—partly from the debts he had left behind him, partly, it is said, from the attentions he had paid to the citizens' wives—that he could not be kept out, and the Archbishop of York, who, perceiving this beforehand, had sued to be admitted into favour, delivered himself and King Henry into his hands. He took his queen out of the sanctuary at Westminster to his mother's palace of Baynard's Castle, and spent Good Friday in London; but next day, 13 April, soon after noon, he marched out with his army to Barnet to meet the Earl of Warwick, who, with Exeter, Montague, and Oxford, were now coming up rather late to contest possession of the capital.

Edward took King Henry along with him to the field. He that evening occupied the town of Barnet, from which his forerriders had expelled those of the Earl of Warwick before he came, and driven them half a mile further, where the earl's main body was drawn up under a hedge. Edward, coming after, placed his men in position nearly opposite to them, but a little to one side. It was by this time dark, and his true position was not understood by the enemy, who continued firing during the night at vacancy. Day broke

next morning between four and five, but a dense mist still obscured matters, and while Edward's forces, being greatly outflanked to the left by those of Warwick, began to give way, they had an almost equal advantage over their opponents at the opposite or eastern end; and while fugitives from the western part of the field carried to London the news that the day was lost for Edward, the combat was still maintained with varying fortunes for three hours or more. Owing to the fog Warwick's men fired upon those of the Earl of Oxford, whose badge, a star with streams, was mistaken for 'the sun of York,' and Oxford with his company fled the field, crying 'Treason!' as they went. At length, after great slaughter on both sides, Edward was completely triumphant, and Warwick and Montague lay dead upon the field. The Earl of Oxford escaped to Scotland.

Next day Edward caused the bodies of Warwick and his brother to be brought to London and exhibited at St. Paul's. He had little leisure to rest in London, for news arrived on Tuesday the 16th of the landing of Margaret and her son at Weymouth; and, after arranging for the sick and wounded who had been with him at Barnet, he left on Friday the 19th, first for Windsor, where he duly kept the feast of St. George, and afterwards to Abingdon, which he reached on the 27th. Uncertain of the enemy's motions he was anxious to intercept them either on the road to London, if they attempted to march thither direct, or near the southern seacoast if they came that way, or passing northwards by the borders of Wales. At length he fought with them at Tewkesbury on 4 May and was completely victorious. Margaret was taken prisoner, her son slain, or more probably murdered after the battle; and Edward further stained his laurels by a gross act of perfidy in beheading two days later the Duke of Somerset and fourteen other persons who had sought refuge in the abbey of Tewkesbury, and been delivered up to him on the assurance of their lives being spared.

The news of the victory at once sufficed to quiet an insurrection that was on the point of breaking out in the north; to suppress which, however, Edward had scarcely gone as far as Coventry when he heard of a much more formidable movement in the south. For Calais being still under the government of Warwick's deputies, they had sent over to England a naval captain named the Bastard Falconbridge [q. v.], who after overawing Canterbury endeavoured to force an entrance into London, 5 May. Foiled in this attempt the Bastard withdrew westward to Kingston-upon-Thames, intending to have offered battle to King Edward in the centre of the kingdom, for he had a strong force with him, reckoned at twenty thousand men, which grew as he advanced, while most of Edward's followers had dispersed after the victory of Tewkesbury. But Scales managed to prevail on one of his adherents, Nicholas Faunt, mayor of Canterbury, to urge him to return to Blackheath, from which place he stole away with only six hundred horsemen out of his army by Rochester to Sandwich, where he stood simply on the defensive.

Edward in the meantime was issuing commissions and raising men in the different counties, so that he arrived in London, 21 May, at the head of thirty thousand men. On the night of his arrival Henry VI died—of a broken heart as Edward's friends pretended. Next day Edward knighted no less than twelve aldermen of London for the good service they had done him, and the day following (Ascension day) he marched forward into Kent. Coming to Canterbury he caused Nicholas Faunt to be brought thither from the Tower and hanged, drawn, and quartered. Some other adherents of the Bastard were also put to death. Commissions were also issued for Kent, Sussex, and Essex to levy fines on those who had gone with him to Blackheath, and many who were not really there were made to pay exorbitantly, some unfortunate men having to sell their spare clothing and borrow money before they were admitted to mercy. On 26 May Edward and his army reached Sandwich, where the Bastard surrendered the town and all his navy, amounting to forty-three vessels.

Edward had now triumphed so decisively over his enemies that the rest of his reign was passed in comparative tranquillity. The direct line of Lancaster was extinct, and the family of John of Gaunt was represented only by Henry Tudor, earl of Richmond, whose ancestors, the Beauforts, were of doubtful legitimacy. Henry's uncle, the Earl of Pembroke, finding no safety in Wales, took him over sea, meaning to go to France, but they were forced to land in Brittany, where Duke Francis II detained them in a kind of honourable confinement, refusing more than one application from King Edward to deliver them up to him, but promising that they should not escape to do him injury. Yet it could only have been on behalf of Richmond that the Earl of Oxford sought unsuccessfully to invade the kingdom in 1473. He landed first at St. Osyth in Essex, 28 May, but made a speedy retreat on hearing that the Earl of Essex was coming to meet him. Then on 30 Sept. he took St. Michael's Mount in

Cornwall by surprise, but was immediately besieged there and surrendered in the following February.

The king began to revive the project of an invasion of France, to be undertaken in concert with his ally the Duke of Burgundy. In 1472, before the Earl of Oxford's attempt, parliament had voted a levy of thirteen thousand archers for the defence of the kingdom against external enemies, and of a tenth to pay expenses; and the grant, which had not yet been fully put in force, was renewed and increased in 1474 with a view to the proposed expedition. The taxation was severely felt, yet it was not sufficient to warrant the enterprise without additional aid, and to make up the deficiency Edward had recourse to a new and unprecedented kind of impost, by which, as the continuator of the 'Croyland Chronicle' remarks, 'every one was to give just what he pleased, or rather what he did not please, by way of benevolence.' Edward himself did not disdain to levy sums in this way by personal solicitation, and in some cases, it would seem, the money was really granted with goodwill. An amusing instance is recorded by Hall the chronicler of a rich widow who on personal solicitation promised the king what was then the large sum of 20*l.*, and on Edward showing his gratitude by a kiss immediately doubled the contribution.

Extraordinary contributions seemed necessary for the object in view. When all was ready Edward crossed to Calais at the head of a splendid army, consisting of fifteen hundred men-at-arms, fifteen thousand archers on horseback, and a large body of foot, another expedition being arranged to land at the same time in Brittany to strengthen the Duke of Brittany against an attack from France. Before embarking at Dover Edward sent Louis a letter of defiance in the approved style of chivalry, so elegantly and politely penned that Commines could hardly believe an Englishman wrote it. He called upon Louis to surrender the kingdom of France to him as rightful owner, that he might relieve the church and the people from the oppression under which they groaned; otherwise all the miseries of war would lie at his door. Louis having read the letter called in the herald who brought it, and told him he was sure his master had no wish to invade France on his own account, but had merely done so to satisfy his own subjects and the Duke of Burgundy; that the latter could give little aid, as he had wasted time and strength over the siege of Neuss, and the summer was already far spent; and that Edward would do well to listen to some accommodation, which the herald might have it in his power to promote. The artifice was successful. The herald, indeed, told Louis that no proposal could be listened to until the whole army had landed in France, and so great was the force that it took three weeks to convey them across the straits of Dover. But the French king when the herald left him had already some reason to believe that he had by his policy taken the heart out of the expedition. The progress of events rather tended to confirm the suspicion he had sown in English minds that they were fighting for the Duke of Burgundy's interests more than for their own; for after Edward's landing, the duke came to meet him, not at the head of an army but merely with a personal escort, and only stayed with him a very short time, feeling himself called away to defend Luxemburg. Nor were the English better pleased when the perfidious constable of St. Pol, a professed ally of Burgundy, but an intriguer who had betrayed all sides in turn, opened fire upon them from St. Quentin. They could not understand the people they had come among, and wondered if Burgundy had any army at all.

In this state of matters Louis sent to the English camp an irregular messenger dressed like a herald, who urged the case for peace with wonderful astuteness; and it was not long before commissioners to treat were appointed on both sides. A seven years' treaty was arranged, with stipulation for a pension of seventy-five thousand crowns to be paid by Louis during the joint lives of the two kings, and a contract for the marriage of the dauphin to Edward's eldest daughter, Elizabeth, as soon as the parties should be of suitable age. The peace was ratified at a personal interview of the two kings at Picquigny on 29 Aug., and the invading army soon returned home without having struck a blow. It was not a very noble conclusion, for Edward really broke faith with his ally the Duke of Burgundy, and several of his council, including his own brother Gloucester, absented themselves from the interview in consequence. The French king, however, was highly pleased, and to allay the prejudices of Edward's councillors gave them handsome presents before they left France and pensions afterwards.

Whatever may be said of Edward's conduct towards Burgundy, he was more faithful on this occasion towards another ally whom Louis vainly endeavoured to induce him to desert. This was the Duke of Brittany, in whose territory the Earl of Richmond had found an asylum, and who it seems, in gratitude to Edward, was on the point of deliver-

ing the fugitive up to him not long afterwards, but that he was dissuaded at the last moment.

Not long after this the Duke of Burgundy met his fate at the battle of Nanci, 5 Jan. 1477, leaving an only daughter, Mary, as his heiress. The Duke of Clarence, who was now a widower, aspired to her hand in marriage, and thereby revived the old jealousy of his brother Edward, who took care to prevent the match. This with other circumstances inflamed the duke's indignation, and his conduct gave so much offence that Edward first had him sent to the Tower, and then accused him before parliament in the beginning of 1478. The scene is recorded by a contemporary with an expression of horror. 'No one,' says the writer, 'argued against the duke except the king, no one made answer to the king except the duke.' Sentence was formally pronounced against him, but the execution was for some time delayed, till the speaker made request in the name of the commons that it should take effect. The king complied; but, to avoid the disgrace of a public execution, ordered it to be done secretly within the Tower, and it was reported that Clarence was drowned in a butt of malmsey.

It was noted that his removal placed the whole kingdom more entirely at Edward's command than it had been before. No other member of the council was so popular or influential; and no one now could advocate a policy opposed to the king's personal will. Yet the memory of what he had done embittered Edward's after years, insomuch that when solicited for the pardon of an offender he would sometimes say, 'O unfortunate brother, for whose life not one creature would make intercession!'

One result of this greater absolutism was that the law officers of the crown became severe in searching out penal offences, by which wealthy gentlemen and nobles were harassed by prosecutions, and the king's treasure increased by fines. But these practices were not long continued. Edward was now wealthy, corpulent, and fond of ease, and he loved popularity too well to endanger it by persistent oppression. Another matter in which he was allowed to have his own way doubtless alarmed many of his subjects long before he found reason to repent the course he had taken himself. His whole foreign policy had undergone a change at the treaty of Picquigny when he accepted a French alliance instead of a Burgundian; and when, after the death of Charles the Bold, Louis XI overran Burgundy and Picardy, depriving the young duchess Mary of her inheritance, she appealed in vain to Edward for assistance. Not to listen to such an appeal was little short of infatuation, for the success of France imperilled English commerce with the Low Countries. But Edward was more afraid of losing the French pension and the stipulated marriage of his daughter to the dauphin, and he was base enough even to offer to take part with Louis if the latter would share with him his conquests on the Somme. His queen, on the other hand, would have engaged him the other way if the council of Flanders would have allowed the marriage of Mary to her brother Anthony, earl Rivers; but the match was considered too unequal in point of rank, and the young lady, for her own protection, was driven to marry Maximilian of Austria.

The French pension was for some years punctually paid, but Louis still delayed sending for the Princess Elizabeth to be married to his son, alleging as his excuse the war in Burgundy, and sending such honourable embassies that Edward's suspicions were completely lulled to sleep. A like spirit showed itself in Edward's relations with Scotland, with which country he had made peace in 1474, marrying his second daughter, Cecily, by proxy, to the eldest son of James III, and had since paid three instalments of her stipulated dowry of twenty thousand marks. But misunderstandings gradually grew up, secretly encouraged by France. A Scotch invasion was anticipated as early as May 1480 (Rymer, xii. 115), and the Scotch actually overran the borders not long after ('Chronicle' cited in Pinkerton, i. 503). James excused the aggression as made without his consent; but Edward made alliances against him with the Lord of the Isles and other Scotch nobles (Rymer, xii. 140), and a secret treaty with his brother Albany, whom he recognised as rightful king of Scotland, on the pretence that James was illegitimate (*ib.* 156). This Albany had been imprisoned by James in Scotland, and had escaped to France, but was now under Edward's protection in England; and he engaged, on being placed on the throne of Scotland, to restore Berwick to the English and abandon the old French alliance. In return for these services Edward promised him the hand of that princess whom he had already given to the Scotch king's heir-apparent, provided Albany on his part could 'make himself clear from all other women.'

An expedition against Scotland, for the equipment of which benevolences had been again resorted to, was at length set on foot in May 1482. It was placed under the command of Richard, duke of Gloucester, and Albany went with it. Berwick was besieged,

and the town soon surrendered, though the castle still held out. The invasion was made easier by the revolt of the Scotch nobles, who hanged James's favourite ministers, shut up James himself in Edinburgh Castle, concluded a treaty with Gloucester and Albany, and bound the town of Edinburgh to repay Edward the money advanced by him for the Princess Cecily's dower, the marriage being now annulled. Nothing, however, was said about Albany's pretensions to the crown, and the Scotch lords undertook to procure his pardon. The invading army withdrew to the borders, and the campaign ended by the capitulation of Berwick Castle on 24 Aug.

Scarcely, however, had the difference with Scotland been arranged, when the full extent of the French king's perfidy was made manifest. The Duchess Mary of Burgundy was unexpectedly killed by a fall from her horse in March 1482, leaving behind her two young children, Philip and Margaret, of whom the former was heir to the duchy. Their father, Maximilian, being entirely dependent for money on the Flemings, who were not his natural subjects, was unable to exercise any authority as their guardian. The men of Ghent, supported by France, controlled everything, and compelled him to conclude with Louis the treaty of Arras (23 Dec. 1482), by which it was arranged that Margaret should be married to the dauphin, and have as her dower the county of Artois and some of the best lands in Burgundy taken from the inheritance of her brother Philip. Thus the compact for the marriage of the dauphin to Edward's daughter was boldly violated, with a view to a future annexation of provinces to the crown of France.

It was remarked that Edward kept his Christmas that year at Westminster with particular magnificence. But the news of the treaty of Arras sank deep into his heart. He thought of vengeance, and called parliament together in January 1483 to obtain further supplies. A tenth and a fifteenth were voted by the commons, not as if for an aggressive war, but expressly 'for the hasty and necessary defence' of the kingdom. The clergy also were called on for a contribution. But while occupied with these thoughts he was visited by illness, which in a short time proved fatal. He died on 9 April 1483, as French writers believed, of mortification at the treaty of Arras.

Commines speaks of Edward IV as the most handsome prince he ever saw, and similar testimony is given by others to his personal appearance. When his coffin was opened at Windsor in 1789 his skeleton measured no less than six feet three inches in length. Although latterly he had grown somewhat corpulent, his good looks had not deserted him, and his ingratiating manners contributed to render him highly popular. The good fortune which attended him throughout life may have been partly owing to this cause as well as to his undoubted valour, for though he never lost a battle, nothing is more astounding than his imprudence and the easy confidence with which he trusted Somerset, Warwick, Montague, and others, all the while they were betraying him. Careless and self-indulgent, he allowed dangers to accumulate; but whenever it came to action he was firm and decisive. His familiarity with the wives of London citizens was the subject of much comment, and so were his exactions, whether in the shape of parliamentary taxations, benevolences, or debasement of the currency, to which last device he had recourse in 1464. His queen, Elizabeth Woodville, bore him ten children, of whom only seven survived him, two of them being sons and five daughters.

[English Chronicle, ed. Davies (Camden Soc.); Wilhelmi Wyrcester Annales; Venetian Cal. vol. i.; Paston Letters; Hist. Croylandensis Continuatio in Fulman's Scriptores; Warkworth's Chronicle; Collections of a London Citizen; Three Fifteenth-century Chronicles; History of the Arrival of Edward IV (the last four published by the Camden Soc.); Leland's Collectanea (ed. 1774), ii. 497–509; Fragment, printed by Hearne, at end of T. Sprotti Chronica (1719); Jehan de Wavrin, Anchiennes Croniques, ed. Dupont; Excerpta Historica, 282–4; Commines; Polydore Vergil; Hall's Chronicle; Fabyan's Chronicle. Besides these sources of information, Habington's History of Edward IV (1640) may be referred to with advantage.] J. G.

EDWARD V (1470–1483), king of England, eldest son of Edward IV by his queen, Elizabeth Woodville [q. v.], was born in the Sanctuary at Westminster on 2 or 3 Nov. 1470, at the time when his father was driven out of his kingdom (see *Gentleman's Magazine* for January 1831, p. 24). He was baptised without ceremony in that place of refuge, the abbot and prior being his godfathers and Lady Scrope his godmother. On 26 June 1471 his father, having recovered the throne, created him Prince of Wales (*Rolls of Parl.* vi. 9), and on 3 July following compelled the lords in parliament to acknowledge him as undoubted heir of the kingdom, swearing that they would take him as king if he survived himself (Rymer, xi. 714). The slaughter of another Edward prince of Wales, the son of Henry VI, at Tewkesbury just two months before, had cleared the way for this creation. Five days later, on 8 July, King

Edward appointed by patent a council for the young prince, consisting of his mother the queen, the Archbishop of Canterbury, his two paternal uncles, the Dukes of Clarence and Gloucester, his maternal uncle, Earl Rivers, with certain bishops and others, to have the control of his education and the rule of his household and lands till he should reach the age of fourteen. On 17 July he received formal grants, which were afterwards confirmed by parliament, of the principality of Wales, the counties palatine of Chester and Flint, and the duchy of Cornwall (*Rolls of Parl.* vi. 9–16). Next year, at the creation of Louis Sieur de la Grutuyse, as Earl of Winchester, he was carried to Whitehall and thence to Westminster in the arms of Thomas Vaughan, who was afterwards appointed his chamberlain and made a knight (*Archæologia*, xxvi. 277). In 1473 several important documents occur relating to him. First, on 20 Feb. a business council was appointed for the affairs of the principality (*Patent Roll*, 12 Edw. IV, pt. 2, m. 21). Then on 23 Sept. the king drew up a set of ordinances alike for the 'virtuous guiding' of the young child and for the good rule of his household, in which a more special charge was given to Earl Rivers and to John Alcock [q. v.] (who was now become bishop of Rochester) than in the appointment of 1471. (See these ordinances, printed in the *Collection of Ordinances for the Household*, published by the Society of Antiquaries 1790, pp. [*27] sq.) On 10 Nov. Bishop Alcock was appointed the young prince's schoolmaster and president of his council, while Earl Rivers on the same day was appointed his governor (*Patent Roll*, 13 Edw. IV, pt. 1, m. 3, and pt. 2, m. 15).

It is clear that as Prince of Wales, although only in his third year, he had already been sent down into that country to keep court there with his mother the queen; for on 2 April Sir John Paston writes to his brother: 'Men say the queen with the prince shall come out of Wales and keep this Easter with the king at Leicester'—a report which he adds was disbelieved by others. On 6 July 1474 a patent was granted to him enabling him to give liveries to his retainers (*ib.* 14 Edw. IV, pt. 1, m. 13). In 1475, when he was only in his fifth year, the king his father on 20 June, just before crossing the Channel to invade France, appointed him his lieutenant and guardian (*custos*) of the kingdom during his absence, with full powers under four different commissions to discharge the functions of royalty (Rymer, xii. 13, 14). That same day King Edward made his will at Sandwich, charging the property of his heir with various charitable bequests, and appointing marriage portions for his daughters on condition that they should be governed in their choice of husbands by Queen Elizabeth Woodville and her son the prince (*Excerpta Historica*, pp. 366–79).

On 2 Jan. 1476 he was appointed justiciar of Wales (*Patent Roll*, 15 Edw. IV, pt. 3, m. 4 *in dorso*), and on 29 Dec. power was given him (of course to be exercised by his council) to appoint other justices in the principality and the marches (*ib.* 16 Edw. IV, pt. 2, m. 22). On 1 Dec. 1477 he received a grant of the castles and lordships of Wigmore, Presteign, Narberth, Radnor, and a number of other places in Wales, to which was added a grant of the manor of Elvell on 9 March 1478, and of Uske and Caerleon on 26 Feb. 1483 (*ib.* 17 Edw. IV, pt. 2, m. 24, 18 Edw. IV, pt. 1, m. 18, and 22–23 Edw. IV, pt. 2, m. 11).

He was only in his thirteenth year when his father died, 9 April 1483, and he became king. His short troubled reign was merely a struggle for power between his maternal relations, the Woodvilles, and his uncle Richard, duke of Gloucester, to whom the care of his person and kingdom seems to have been bequeathed in the last will of his father. When his uncle Rivers and his half-brother, Lord Richard Grey, were conducting him up to London for his coronation, which his mother had persuaded the council to appoint for so early a date as 4 May, they were overtaken at Northampton by Gloucester and Buckingham, or rather, leaving the king at Stony Stratford, they rode back to Northampton to meet those two noblemen on 29 April, and found next morning that they were made prisoners. Probably there would have been a pitched battle, but that the council in London had strongly resisted a proposal of the queen dowager that the young king should come up with a very large escort. As it was, a good deal of armour was found in the baggage of the royal suite, which, taken in connection with some other things, did not speak well for the intentions of the Woodville party. At least popular feeling seems rather to have been with the Duke of Gloucester when he sent Rivers and Grey to prison at Pomfret, and conducted his young nephew to London with every demonstration of loyal and submissive regard.

It was on 4 May—the very day fixed by the council for his coronation—that Edward thus entered the capital. His mother meanwhile had thrown herself into the Sanctuary at Westminster. It was determined that he himself should take up his abode in the Tower, and while the day of his coronation was deferred at first only to 22 June, a parliament

was summoned for the 25th of the same month, ostensibly with a view to continue his uncle Gloucester in the office of protector. But Gloucester's real design was to dethrone him; and as he found that in this matter not even Hastings would support him, he caused that nobleman suddenly to be arrested at the council table and beheaded within the Tower on 13 June. A secret plot suddenly discovered was alleged to justify the act; terror reigned everywhere, and Westminster was full of armed men. On the 16th the protector induced a deputation of the council, headed by Cardinal Bourchier, to visit the queen in the Sanctuary and persuade her to give up her second son, the Duke of York, to keep company with his brother in the Tower. She yielded, apparently seeing that otherwise she would be compelled, for it had actually been decided to use force if necessary.

The coronation was now again deferred till 2 Nov., as if nothing but unavoidable accidents had interfered with it. But on Sunday, 22 June, a sermon was preached at Paul's Cross by one Dr. Shaw, brother of the lord mayor, on the text 'Bastard slips shall not take deep root' (Wisdom iv. 3), in which the validity of the late king's marriage was impugned, and his children declared illegitimate, so that, as the preacher maintained, Richard, duke of Gloucester, was the rightful sovereign. The result, however, was only to fill the listeners with shame and indignation. A no less ineffectual appeal was made to the citizens the next Tuesday at the Guildhall, when Buckingham made an eloquent speech in support of Richard's claim to the throne. But on the following day, 25 June, on which parliament had been summoned to meet, and when there actually did meet an assembly of lords and commons, though apparently not a true parliament, a roll was brought in setting forth the invalidity of Edward IV's marriage with Elizabeth Woodville, the evils which had arisen from it, and the right of the Duke of Gloucester to the crown. A deputation of the lords and commons, joined by the mayor and chief citizens of London, then waited on Richard at Baynard's Castle, and persuaded him with feigned reluctance to assume the royal dignity. The brief reign of Edward V was thus at an end, and it is tolerably certain that his life was cut short soon after. But the precise time that he and his brother were murdered is unknown. The fact was not divulged till a pretty widespread movement had been organised for their liberation from captivity. Then it transpired that they had been cut off by violence, and the world at large was horrorstruck, while some, half incredulous, suspected that they had been only sent abroad. But conviction deepened as time went on, and many years afterwards the details of the story were collected by Sir Thomas More from sources which he believed entirely credible.

From this account it would appear that Richard III, when shortly after his coronation he set out on a progress, despatched a messenger named John Green to Sir Robert Brackenbury, constable of the Tower, requiring him to put the two princes to death. Brackenbury refused, and Richard soon after sent Sir James Tyrell to London with a warrant to Brackenbury to deliver up the keys of the fortress to him for one night. Tyrell accordingly obtained possession of the place, and his groom, John Dighton, by the help of Miles Forest, one of four gaolers who had charge of the young princes, obtained entrance into their chamber while they were asleep. Forest and Dighton then smothered them under pillows, and, after calling Sir James to view the bodies, buried them at the foot of a staircase, from which place, as More supposed, they were afterwards secretly removed.

From the details given by More the murder could only have taken place, at the earliest, in the latter part of August, as Green found Richard at Warwick on returning to him with the news of Brackenbury's refusal; but it may have been some weeks later. The doubts which Horace Walpole endeavoured to throw upon the fact have not been seriously entertained by any critic, and in the fuller light of more recent criticism are even less probable than before. Although it would be too much to say that the two bodies discovered in the Tower in the days of Charles II, and buried in Westminster Abbey, were unquestionably those of the two princes, there certainly is a strong probability in favour of their genuineness, not only from the apparent ages of the skeletons, but also from the position in which they were found—at the foot of a staircase in the White Tower—which seems to show that Sir Thomas More's information was correct as to the sort of place where they were bestowed, though his surmise was wrong as to their subsequent removal.

[Fabyan's Chronicle; Polydore Vergil; Hall's Chronicle; Hist. Croylandensis Contin. in Fulman's Scriptores; Excerpta Historica, 14, 16; Jo. Rossi Historia Regum, ed. Hearne; More's Hist. of Richard III.] J. G.

EDWARD VI (1537–1553), king of England, was son of Henry VIII by his third wife, Jane Seymour, daughter of Sir John Seymour of Wolf Hall, Savernake, Wiltshire. His father married 19 May 1536, and the son

was born at Hampton Court 12 Oct. 1537. A letter under the queen's signet announced the event to 'the lord privy seal' on the same day. The christening took place in the chapel at Hampton Court on 15 Oct. Princess Mary was godmother, and Archbishop Cranmer and the Duke of Norfolk godfathers. The Marchioness of Exeter carried the infant in her arms during the ceremony. On 19 Oct. Hugh Latimer sent the minister Cromwell a characteristic letter, entreating that the child should be brought up in the protestant faith. Queen Jane Seymour died on 24 Oct., and the despatch sent to foreign courts to announce her death dwelt on the flourishing health of the prince. In his first year Holbein painted his portrait and that of his wet nurse, 'Mother Iak.' As early as March 1539 a separate household was established for the boy. Sir William Sidney became chamberlain, and Sir John Cornwallis steward. There were also appointed a comptroller, vice-chamberlain, almoner, dean, lady-mistress, nurse, and rockers. Lady Bryan, who had brought up both the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth, received the office of lady-mistress, and Sybil Penne, sister of Sir William Sidney's wife, was nominated chief nurse in October 1538. George Owen was the prince's physician from the first. The royal nursery was stationary for the most part at Hampton Court, where the Princess Mary paid many visits to her little stepbrother in 1537 and 1538. The lords of the council were granted a first audience in September 1538, while Edward was at Havering-atte-Bower, Essex. In February 1538–9 the French ambassador, and in October 1542 Con O'Neil, earl of Tyrone, visited the child. In 1543 his household was temporarily removed to Ashridge, Hertfordshire. In July of the same year the war with Scotland was brought to a close. The chief stipulation of the peace-treaty was that the boy should marry Mary Queen of Scots, who, although a queen, was not at the time quite seven months old.

Until he was six Edward was brought up 'among the women' (*Journal*, 209). At that age Dr. Richard Cox [q. v.] became his first schoolmaster. In July 1544 Sir John Cheke [q. v.] was summoned from Cambridge 'as a supplement to Mr. Coxe,' and to Sir Anthony Cooke [q. v.] Edward also owed some part of his education. On several occasions Roger Ascham gave him lessons in penmanship; but Edward, although he wrote clearly and regularly, never attained any remarkable skill in the art. Latin, Greek, and French chiefly occupied him. He wrote in Latin to his godfather Cranmer when he was eight. In 1546 Dr. Cox stated that he knew 'four books of Cato' by heart, and 'things of the Bible,' Vives, Æsop, and 'Latin-making.' His three extant exercise-books, dated 1548 to 1550 (one is at the British Museum and two in the Bodleian Library), are chiefly filled with extracts from Cicero's philosophical works and Aristotle's 'Ethics.' Ascham, writing to Sturm 14 Dec. 1550, when Edward was thirteen, reported that he had read all Aristotle's 'Ethics' and 'Dialectics,' and was translating Cicero's 'De Philosophia' into Greek. The books in his library, still preserved in the Royal Library at the British Museum, include an edition of Thucydides (Basle, 1540), besides most of the Fathers' writings. John Bellemain was Edward's French tutor, and Fuller states that he had a German tutor named Randolph, but no such person is mentioned elsewhere. Martin Bucer doubtfully asserts that Edward spoke Italian. Philip van Wilder taught him to play on the lute, and he exhibited his skill to the French ambassador in 1550. Probably Dr. Christopher Tye, who set the Acts of the Apostles to music, and Thomas Sternhold, the versifier of the Psalms, also gave him musical instruction. The prince took an interest in astronomy, which he defended in a written paper in 1551, and he had an elaborate quadrant constructed, which is now in the British Museum. Always of a studious disposition, Edward would 'sequester himself into some chamber or gallery' to learn his lessons by heart, and was always cheerful at his books (Foxe). Little time was devoted to games, but he occasionally took part in tilting, shooting, hunting, hawking, and prisoners' base. As early as August 1546 Annebaut, the French ambassador, was enthusiastic about the boy's accomplishments, and in 1547 William Thomas, clerk of the council, described his knowledge and courtesy as unexampled in a child of ten.

Many highborn youths of about his own age were his daily companions, and shared, according to the practice of the time, in his education. Among them were Henry Brandon, duke of Norfolk, and his brother Charles, his cousin, Edward Seymour (heir of Protector Somerset), Lord Maltravers (heir of the Earl of Arundel), John, lord Lumley, Henry, lord Strange (heir of the Earl of Derby), John Dudley (son of the Earl of Warwick), Francis, lord Russell, Henry, lord Stafford (heir of the last Duke of Buckingham), Lord Thomas Howard (son of the attainted Earl of Surrey), Lord Giles Paulet, and James Blount, lord Mountjoy. But his favourite schoolfellow was Barnaby Fitzpatrick [q. v.], heir of Barnaby, lord of Upper Ossory, with whom he maintained in the last years of his short life an affectionate correspondence (printed by

Horace Walpole, 1772). Fuller and Burnet assert that Fitzpatrick was the prince's 'whipping-boy,' suffering in his own person the punishments due to the prince's offences.

Edward was at Hatfield when Henry VIII died (21 Jan. 1546–7). He was little more than nine, and had never been formally created Prince of Wales, although the ceremony had been in contemplation. Henry's will, dated 30 Dec. 1546, constituted Edward his lawful heir and successor, and named eighteen executors to act as a council of regency during the prince's minority, with twelve others as assistant-executors to be summoned to council at the pleasure of the first-named body. Among the chief executors were Edward's uncle, the Earl of Hertford, and Viscount Lisle (afterwards Duke of Northumberland). On the day after Henry's death Hertford brought Edward and his sister Elizabeth to Enfield, and on Monday, 31 Jan., Edward was taken to the Tower of London. On Tuesday the lords of the council did homage, and Lord-chancellor Wriothesley announced that the council of regency had chosen Hertford to be governor and protector of the realm. The lord chancellor and other officers of justice resigned their posts to be reinstalled in them by the new king. On 4 Feb. the lord protector assumed the additional offices of lord treasurer and earl marshal. Dudley became chamberlain, and the protector's brother, Thomas Seymour, admiral. All other offices were left in the hands of the previous holders. On Sunday, 6 Feb., the young king, still at the Tower, was created a knight by his uncle, the protector, and on 18 Feb. he distributed a number of peerages among his councillors, promoting the protector to the dukedom of Somerset, Dudley to the earldom of Warwick, and Sir Thomas Seymour to the barony of Seymour of Sudeley. A chapter of the Garter was held on the same day, and the decoration conferred on the new Lord Seymour and others.

The coronation took place in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, 20 Feb. On the previous day a sumptuous procession conducted the little king from the Tower to Whitehall. Archbishop Cranmer placed three crowns in succession on the boy's head, the Confessor's crown, the imperial crown, and one that had been made specially for the occasion. A brief charge was delivered by the archbishop, in which the child was acknowledged to be the supreme head of the church. The two following days were devoted to jousts which the king witnessed. During his short reign Edward divided most of his time between Whitehall and Greenwich; but he occasionally lodged at St. James's Palace, and in summer at Hampton Court, Oatlands, and Windsor.

The religious sympathies of the young prince soon declared themselves. During the first year of his reign he made the money-offerings prescribed by the ancient catholic ritual for Sundays and saints' days, but after June 1548 the payments were discontinued, although a sum was still set apart for daily alms, and for royal maundies on Maundy Thursday and Easter-day. Dr. Nicholas Ridley, who became bishop of Rochester in 1547, regularly preached before the king from the opening of the reign. But Hugh Latimer was the favourite occupant of the pulpit in the royal chapel, and a special pulpit was erected in the private gardens at Whitehall to enable a greater number of persons to hear him preach. Edward 'used to note every notable sentence' in the sermons, 'especially if it touched a king,' and talked them over with his youthful companions afterwards. On 29 June 1548 Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, preached, and was expected to compromise himself by attacking the reformed doctrine, but he disappointed his enemies by acknowledging the king's title as supreme head of the church. When parliament (23 Nov.) was debating the Book of Common Prayer, and 'a notable disputation of the sacrament' arose 'in the parliament house,' Edward is reported to have taken keen interest in the discussion, and shrewdly criticised some of the speakers. In Lent 1549 Latimer preached his celebrated series of sermons addressed to the young king's court. A year later, Hooper, Ponet, Lever, Day, and other pronounced reformers, occupied the pulpit, and at the end of the reign John Knox delivered several sermons at Windsor, Hampton Court, and Westminster.

Somerset and his fellow-councillors were of the king's way of thinking. The early legislation of the reign respecting the prayer-book, uniformity of service, and the formularies of the church seemed to set the Reformation on a permanent and unassailable footing. Reformers hastened to England from foreign countries, and they vied with native protestants in eulogising Edward's piety and devotion to their doctrine, to which they pretended to attribute the religious advance. Bartholomew Traheron, writing to Bullinger of Zurich (28 Sept. 1548), says of the king: 'A more holy disposition has nowhere existed in our time.' Martin Bucer reported (15 May 1550) that 'no study delights him more than that of the holy scriptures, of which he reads daily ten chapters with the greatest attention.' Bucer also wrote to Calvin ten days later that 'the king is exerting all his power

for the restoration of God's kingdom.' Peter Martyr and John ab Ulmis spoke in a like strain. When in July 1550 Hooper was offered the bishopric of Gloucester, and raised objections to part of the requisite oath, Edward is said to have erased the objectionable clause with his own pen (*Zurich Letters*, iii. 567). On 4 Dec. 1550 a French protestant in London, Francis Burgoyne, sent to Calvin a description of an interview he had with Edward, when the young king made many inquiries about the great reformer. Calvin, taking the hint, sent the king a long letter of advice and exhortation in April 1551. When Knox wrote later of his experience as a preacher at the court, he described as unsurpassable and altogether beyond his years the king's 'godly disposition towards virtue, and chiefly towards God's truth.' Nicholas Udal, in his dedication of his translation of Erasmus's paraphrase of the New Testament, is extravagantly eulogistic, and Bale, in his 'Scriptores,' adds to his own praises of the English 'Josiah,' as Edward was generally called by his panegyrists, the testimonies of Sleidan and Bibliander, besides complimentary epigrams by Parkhurst.

Edward lived a solitary life. He only acknowledged any friendship with Cheke and Fitzpatrick. His sisters had separate households and seldom saw him. His intellectual precocity and religious ardour were unaccompanied by any show of natural affection. Although so young, he showed traces of his father's harshness as well as much natural dignity of bearing. Protector Somerset was nearly always with him, but the king treated him with indifference. The protector left for Scotland in 1547 to enforce by war the fulfilment of the marriage treaty between Edward and Queen Mary which the Scottish rulers were anxious to repudiate. The French aided the Scotch, and Boulogne was taken. In Somerset's absence his treacherous brother, Lord Seymour, the admiral, attempted to oust him from all place in the king's regard. Lord Seymour constantly sought interviews with Edward, and remarked on one occasion that the protector was growing old. Thereupon the king coolly replied, 'It were better that he should die.' This is the king's own account of the conversation. After Lord Seymour was thrown into the Tower by the protector on a charge of treason, the privy council went in a body to the king (24 Feb. 1548–9) to demand authorisation for further proceedings; the king gave the required consent with much dignity and the utmost readiness, and on 10 March showed equal coolness in agreeing to his execution. In October 1549 the councillors, under Dudley, revolted against the protector. On 6 Oct. Somerset heard tidings of their action, and hastily removed the king from Hampton Court to Windsor. He was subsequently charged with having alarmed Edward by telling him that his life was in peril, with having injured his health by the hastiness of his removal, and with having left the royal room at Windsor unguarded while his own was fully garrisoned. Somerset was sent to the Tower on 14 Oct. On 12 Oct. the hostile councillors explained to the king at Windsor the reasons of their policy. The boy, who had been suffering from 'a rheum,' at once fell in with their suggestions, and catalogued in his journal his uncle's faults: 'Ambition, vainglory, entering into rash wars in my youth . . . enriching himself of my treasure, following his own opinion, and doing all by his own authority.' On 15 Oct. the council met at Hampton Court and nominated the Marquis of Northampton, the Earls of Arundel and Warwick, and Lords Wentworth, St. John, and Russell, to be lords governors of the king for political and educational purposes. New honours and offices were bestowed on the prominent leaders in the revolt; the hopes of the Roman catholics rose, but it was soon apparent that much of Somerset's power had been transferred to the Earl of Warwick, who had no intention of reversing the ecclesiastical policy. On 17 Oct. the king made a state progress through London, and in the following summer took an exceptionally long journey from Westminster to Windsor (23 July), Guildford, Oking, Oatlands, Nonsuch, Richmond, and back to Westminster (16 Oct.) All the halts at night were made at the royal palaces or manor-houses. At Oking the Princess Mary was summoned to meet her brother.

Somerset was pardoned 16 Feb. 1549–50, and returned to court (31 March) and to the council (10 April) with diminished prestige. Lady Seymour, the king's grandmother and Somerset's mother, died in the following autumn, and the council on 18 Oct. deprecated the wearing of mourning for her. Schemes of marriage for the young king were now under discussion. The treaty of marriage with Mary Queen of Scots made in 1543 had been finally repudiated by Scotland, and the girl was betrothed to Francis, the dauphin of France. According to John Lesley, bishop of Ross, when Edward entertained Mary's mother, Mary of Guise, on her passing through England in July 1551, he reminded her of the old engagement, and asked for its fulfilment (*De Origine Scotorum*, Rome, 1578, p. 512), but the story is not supported. On 24 March 1549–50 peace was signed with both France and Scotland and it was decided that Edward

should propose for the hand of Princess Elizabeth, daughter of Henri II of France, the lady who ultimately married Philip II of Spain. In May 1551 the Marquis of Northampton went on a special embassy to Paris to invest the princess's father with the order of the Garter, and to determine settlements. The marriage was agreed to, but it was decided to defer its celebration till both parties had reached the age of twelve. In July a French ambassador, Maréchal de St. André, brought Edward the order of St. Michael, and Warwick procured a portrait of the princess, which he directed the king to display so as to arrest the ambassador's attention. The marriage could hardly have commended itself to Edward's religious prejudices, which grew stronger with his years. The question of permitting Princess Mary to celebrate mass had more than once been under the council's discussion, and permission had been refused. When she positively declined to adopt the new service-book in May 1551, the emperor instructed Sir Richard Morysin, the English ambassador at his court, to demand in his name complete religious liberty for the princess. Some of the councillors suggested that the wishes of the emperor should be respected, but the king is stated to have resolutely opposed the grant of special privileges to his sister (cf. *Harl. MS.* 353, f. 130). Jane Dormer, duchess of Feria, asserts that Mary was left practically at liberty to do as she pleased, that she had much affection for her brother, and had hopes of converting him to her faith. Parsons repeated the story in his 'Three Conversions of England' (1604), pt. iv. p. 360. But there is no reason to doubt the king's resolution whenever Romish practices were in debate. The king with Cranmer has been charged with personal responsibility for the execution of Joan Bocher [q. v.], the anabaptist, in May 1550; but although he just mentions her death in his diary, there is no reason to suppose that he was consulted in the matter.

On 16 Oct. 1551 Somerset was attacked anew. Warwick resolved to secure the reins of government, and as soon as he had been created Duke of Northumberland contrived to have Somerset sent to the Tower. Edward was an easy prey to the ambitious nobleman. He accepted all the false charges preferred against Somerset as true, related the proceedings against his uncle with great fulness in his diary, and after signing the warrant for his execution laconically noted that 'the Duke of Somerset had his head cut off on Tower Hill on 22 Jan. 1551–2.' The same heartlessness is evinced in the king's reference to the matter in his correspondence with Fitzpatrick.

Edward, whose health had hitherto been good, was constitutionally weak, and in April 1552 was attacked by both measles and smallpox. On 15 April the parliament, which had sat from the beginning of the reign, was dissolved, and the royal assent given by commission to many bills. On 12 May Edward was sufficiently recovered to ride in Greenwich Park with a party of archers. Soon afterwards Cheke, the king's tutor, fell ill, and Edward showed unusual concern. He attributed Cheke's recovery to his prayers. In the autumn William Thomas, clerk of the council, offered instruction in statecraft to the king, and submitted eighty-five political questions for his consideration. Edward agreed to receive from Thomas essays on stipulated subjects, and Thomas submitted to him papers on a proposal to reform the debased currency, on foreign alliances, and forms of government. Girolamo Cardano, the great Milanese physician, visited him in September or October, and wrote an interesting account of his interviews, in which he eulogised the young king's learning. He cast Edward's horoscope and foretold that he would reach middle age.

The empire and France were at war in the summer of 1552, and Edward watched the struggle with the utmost interest. The growth of his intelligence in political questions is well attested by Queen Mary of Guise, who asserted, after visiting him in 1551, that he was wiser than any other of the three kings whom she had met. The emperor applied for the fulfilment of Henry VIII's treaty of alliance, while the French king pointed out that he was allied with the protestant princes of Europe, and therefore deserved English aid. But Edward's advisers maintained a strict neutrality. On 19 June 1552 he signed letters of congratulations on recent success addressed to both combatants. In July, at the request of Northumberland, Edward urged a marriage between the duke's son, Guildford, and Lady Margaret Clifford, a kinswoman of the royal family. Edward's complete subjection to Northumberland caused much dissatisfaction outside the court. In August 1552 a woman, Elizabeth Huggons, was charged with libelling Northumberland for his treatment of Somerset, and with saying that 'the king showed himself an unnatural nephew, and withall she did wish that she had the jerking of him.' On 22 Aug. Edward made a progress to Christchurch, Hampshire, and wrote of it with satisfaction to his friend Fitzpatrick. Knox asserted that in the last sermon he preached before the court he was not sparing in his denunciations of Northumberland and Winchester, who wholly controlled the king's

action (*Faythful Admonition*, 1554). With November 1552 Edward's journal ceases. The following Christmas was celebrated with prolonged festivities at Greenwich, but in January the king's fatal sickness began. William Baldwin, in his 'Funeralles of Edward the Sixt,' attributes it to a cold caught at tennis. A racking cough proved the first sign of rapid consumption. On 6 Feb. Princess Mary visited him in state. On 16 Feb. the performance of a play was countermanded 'by occasion that his grace was sick.' On 1 March Edward opened a new parliament; the members assembled at Whitehall in consequence of his illness, and he took the communion after Bishop Ridley's sermon. On 31 March the members again assembled at Whitehall, and Edward dissolved them.

According to Grafton, Ridley's frequent references in his sermons to the distress among the London poor powerfully excited the king's sympathy, and he expressed great anxiety in his last year to afford them some relief. He discussed the matter with Ridley, and wrote for suggestions to the lord mayor. Stringent legislation against vagabonds and beggars had been passed in the first year of the reign, but the evil had not decreased. After due consultation it was resolved that the royal palace of Bridewell should be handed over to the corporation of London as 'a workhouse for the poor and idle people.' On 10 April the grant was made, and on the next day Edward received the lord mayor at Whitehall and knighted him. The palace was not applied to its new uses till 1555 (cf. A. J. Copeland's *Bridewell Royal Hospital*, 22–38). At the same time Edward arranged that Christ's Hospital, the old Grey Friars' monastery, should be dedicated to the service of poor scholars, and that St. Thomas's Hospital should be applied for the reception and medical treatment of the sick. The citizens of London subscribed money for these purposes, and they, and not the king, were mainly responsible for the success of the charitable schemes. A similar application of Savoy Hospital received Edward's assent.

In the middle of April Edward went by water to Greenwich. Alarming reports of his health were current in May, and many persons were set in the pillory for hinting that he was suffering from the effects of a slow-working poison. Dr. George Owen and Dr. Thomas Wendy were in constant attendance with four other medical men, but they foolishly allowed experiments to be tried with a quack remedy which had disastrous effects. In the middle of May Antoine de Noailles, the French ambassador, was received by the king, who was then very weak, and on 16 May Princess Mary wrote to congratulate him on a reported improvement. On 21 May Lord Guildford Dudley was married to Lady Jane Grey. In the second week of June the king's case seemed hopeless, and Northumberland induced him to draw up a 'devise of the succession' in Lady Jane's favour and to the exclusion of his sisters. In the autograph draft the king first wrote that the crown was to pass 'to the L' Janes heires masles,' but for these words he subsequently substituted 'to the L' Jane & her heires masles' (see *Petyt MS.* in Inner Temple Library). On 14 June Lord-chief-justice Montagu and the law officers of the crown were summoned to the king's chamber to attest the devise. Montagu indignantly declined, but he was recalled the next day, and on receiving a general pardon from the king to free him from all the possible consequences of his act, he consented to prepare the needful letters patent. An undertaking to carry out the king's wishes was signed by the councillors, law officers, and many others. The original instrument is in Harl. MS. 35, f. 384. According to notes made for his last will at the same time Edward left 10,000*l.* to each of his sisters provided they chose husbands with consent of the council; gave 150*l.* a year to St. John's College, Cambridge; directed that the Savoy Hospital scheme should be carried out; that a tomb should be erected to his father's memory, and monuments placed over the graves of Edward IV and Henry VII. He warned England against entering on foreign wars or altering her religion. Almost the last suitor to have an audience was (Sir) Thomas Gresham, the English agent in Flanders, to whom the king promised some reward for his services, saying that he should know that he served a king. On 1 July the council declared that the alarming accounts of Edward's condition were false, but he died peacefully in the arms of his attendant, Sir Henry Sidney, on 6 July, after repeating a prayer of his own composition. The body was embalmed, and on 7 Aug., after the Duke of Northumberland's vain effort to give practical effect to Edward's devise of the succession [see Dudley, Lady Jane, and Dudley, John], the remains were removed to Whitehall. The funeral took place the next day, in Henry VII's Chapel, but no monument marked the grave. The chief mourner was Lord-treasurer Winchester, and the cost of the ceremony amounted to 5,946*l.* 9*s.* 9*d.* Queen Mary attended high mass for the dead in the Tower chapel on the day of the funeral.

In stature Edward was short for his age; he was of fair complexion, with grey eyes and sedate bearing. His eyes were weak (cf.

Peter Levens's *Pathway to Health*, 1632, f. 12), and he sometimes suffered from deafness. An 'epitaph' ballad was issued on his death, and in 1560 William Baldwin issued a long poem, 'Funeralles of Edward the Sixt.'

Numberless portraits of Edward are extant, nearly all of which are attributed to Holbein. Sketches of the prince as an infant, at the age of seven and at the date of his accession (in profile), are now at Windsor. The two first have been engraved by Dalton, Bartolozzi, and Cooper. The finished picture painted from the first was Holbein's gift to Henry VIII in 1539, and was engraved by Hollar in 1650; the finished picture from the second sketch belongs to the Marquis of Exeter; that from the third belongs to the Earl of Pembroke. At Christ's Hospital are a portrait at the age of nine (on panel), and copies from originals at Petworth and Hampton Court painted after his accession. The two latter have been repeatedly engraved. Guilliam Stretes, Marc Willems, and Hans Huet are known to have been employed by Edward VI in portrait-painting, and they are doubtless responsible for some of the pictures ascribed to Holbein. Edward VI also figures in the great family picture at Hampton Court with his father, stepmother (Catherine Parr), and two sisters; in the picture of his coronation, engraved from the original at Cowdray (now burnt) by Basire in 1787; in the drawing of his council in Grafton's 'Statutes,' 1548. In Bale's 'Scriptores,' 1549, there is an engraving representing Bale giving the king a book, and in Cranmer's 'Catechism,' 1548, is a similar illustration. 'Latimer preaching before Edward' appears in Foxe's 'Acts and Monuments,' and Vertue engraved a picture by Holbein of Edward VI and the lord mayor founding the city hospital, the original of which is in Bridewell. Seventeenth-century statues are at St. Thomas's and Christ's Hospitals. An older bust is at Wilton.

Edward's 'Journal'—a daily chronicle of his life from his accession to 28 Nov. 1552—in his autograph, is in the Cottonian Library at the British Museum (*Nero MS.* C. x.) Its authenticity is thoroughly established. It formed the foundation of Hayward's 'Life,' and was first printed by Burnet in his 'History of the Reformation.' Declamations in Greek and Latin, French essays, private and public letters, notes for a reform of the order of the Garter, and notes of sermons are extant in the king's own handwriting, chiefly in the British Museum Library. All these have been printed in J. G. Nichols's 'Literary Remains of Edward VI.' His own copy of the 'Latin Grammar' (1540) is at Lambeth; another copy richly bound for his use (dated 1542) is at the British Museum. The French treatise by the king against the papal supremacy was published separately in an English translation in 1682 and 1810, and with the original in 1874. The rough draft in the king's handwriting is in Brit. Mus. MS. Addit. 5464, and the perfected copy in the Cambridge Univ. Library, Dd. xii. 59.

[A complete memoir, with extracts from the Privy Council Registers and from other original documents, is prefixed to J. G. Nichols's Literary Remains (Roxburghe Club, 1857). This memoir supersedes Sir John Hayward's Life (1630) and Tytler's England under Edward VI and Mary (1839). Other authorities are Machyn's Diary (Camd. Soc.); Chronicle of the Grey Friars (Camd. Soc.); Chronicle of Queen Mary and Queen Jane (Camd. Soc.); Grafton's Chronicle; Foxe's Acts, which devotes much space to Edward's reign and character; Zurich Letters, vol. i.; Epistolæ Aschami; Cal. State Papers (Domestic); Strype's Annals, and Historia delle cose occorse nel regno d'Inghilterra in materia del Duca di Nortomberlan (Venice, 1558). Mr. Froude's History of England, Canon Dixon's Church History, and Lingard's History give elaborate accounts of the events of the time.]

S. L. L.

EDWARD, Prince of Wales (1330–1376), called the Black Prince, and sometimes Edward IV (*Eulogium*) and Edward of Woodstock (Baker), the eldest son of Edward III [q. v.] and Queen Philippa, was born at Woodstock on 15 June 1330. His father on 16 Sept. allowed five hundred marks a year from the profits of the county of Chester for his maintenance, and on 25 Feb. following the whole of these profits were assigned to the queen for maintaining him and the king's sister Eleanor (*Fœdera*, ii. 798, 811). In the July of that year the king proposed to marry him to a daughter of Philip VI of France (*ib.* p. 822). On 18 March 1333 he was invested with the earldom and county of Chester, and in the parliament of 9 Feb. 1337 he was created Duke of Cornwall and received the duchy by charter dated 17 March. This is the earliest instance of the creation of a duke in England. By the terms of the charter the duchy was to be held by him and the eldest sons of kings of England (Courthope, p. 9). His tutor was Dr. Walter Burley [q. v.] of Merton College, Oxford. His revenues were placed at the disposal of his mother in March 1334 for the expenses she incurred in bringing up him and his two sisters, Isabella and Joan (*Fœdera*, ii. 880). Rumours of an impending French invasion led the king in August 1335 to order that he and his household should remove to Nottingham Castle as a place of safety (*ib.* p. 919). When two cardinals came to England at the end of

1337 to make peace between the king and Philip, the Duke of Cornwall is said to have met them outside the city of London, and in company with many nobles to have conducted them to the king (Holinshed). On 11 July 1338 his father, who was on the point of leaving England for Flanders, appointed him guardian of the kingdom during his absence, and he was appointed to the same office on 27 May 1340 and 5 Oct. 1342 (*Fœdera*, ii. 1049, 1125, 1212); he was of course too young to take any save a nominal part in the administration, which was carried on by the council. In order to attach John, duke of Brabant, to his cause, the king in 1339 proposed a marriage between the young Duke of Cornwall and John's daughter Margaret, and in the spring of 1345 wrote urgently to Pope Clement VI for a dispensation for this marriage (*ib.* ii. 1083, iii. 32, 35). On 12 May 1343 Edward created the duke Prince of Wales, in a parliament held at Westminster, investing him with a circlet, gold ring, and silver rod. The prince accompanied his father to Sluys on 3 July 1345, and Edward tried to persuade the burgomasters of Ghent, Bruges, and Ypres to accept his son as their lord, but the murder of Van Artevelde put an end to this project. Both in September and in the following April the prince was called on to furnish troops from his principality and earldom for the impending campaign in France, and as he incurred heavy debts in the king's service his father authorised him to make his will, and provided that in case he fell in the war his executors should have all his revenue for a year (*ib.* iii. 84). He sailed with the king on 11 July, and as soon as he landed at La Hogue received knighthood from his father (*ib.* p. 90; letter of Edward III to Archbishop of York, *Retrospective Review*, i. 119; *Rot. Parl.* iii. 163; Chandos, l. 145). Then he 'made a right good beginning,' for he rode through the Cotentin, burning and ravaging as he went, and distinguished himself at the taking of Caen and in the engagement with the force under Godemar du Faÿ, which endeavoured to prevent the English army from crossing the Somme by the ford of Blanquetaque. Early on Saturday, 26 Aug., he received the sacrament with his father at Crécy, and took the command of the right, or van, of the army with the Earls of Warwick and Oxford, Geoffrey Harcourt, Chandos, and other leaders, and at the head, it is said, though the numbers are by no means trustworthy, of eight hundred men-at-arms, two thousand archers, and a thousand Welsh foot. When the Genoese bowmen were discomfited and the front line of the French was in some disorder, the prince appears to have quitted his position in order to fall on their second line. At this moment, however, the Count of Alençon charged his division with such fury that he was in much peril, and the leaders who commanded with him sent a messenger to tell his father that he was in great straits and to beg for succour. When Edward learned that his son was unwounded, he bade the messenger go back and say that he would send no help, for he would that the lad should win his spurs (the prince was, however, already a knight), that the day should be his, and that he and those who had charge of him should have the honour of it. It is said that the prince was thrown to the ground (Baker, p. 167) and was rescued by Richard de Beaumont, who carried the banner of Wales, and who threw the banner over the prince, bestrode his body, and beat back his assailants (*Histoire des mayeurs d'Abbeville*, p. 328). Harcourt now sent to Arundel for help, and he forced back the French, who had probably by this time advanced to the rising ground of the English position. A flank attack on the side of Wadicourt was next made by the Counts of Alençon and Ponthieu, but the English were strongly entrenched there, and the French were unable to penetrate the defences and lost the Duke of Lorraine and the Counts of Alençon and Blois. The two front lines of their army were utterly broken before King Philip's division engaged. Then Edward appears to have advanced at the head of the reserve, and the rout soon became complete. When Edward met his son after the battle was over, he embraced him and declared that he had acquitted himself loyally, and the prince bowed low and did reverence to his father. The next day he joined the king in paying funeral honours to the king of Bohemia (Baron Seymour de Constant, *Bataille de Crécy*, ed. 1846; Louandre, *Histoire d'Abbeville*; *Archæologia*, xxviii. 171).

It is commonly said that the prince received the name of the Black Prince after the battle of Crécy, and that he was so called because he wore black armour at the battle. The first recorded notices of the appellation seem to be given by Leland (*Collectanea*, ed. Hearne, 1774, ii. 307) in a heading to the 'Itinerary' extracted from 'Eulogium.' The 'Black Prince,' however, is not in the 'Eulogium' of the Rolls Series, except in the editor's marginal notes. Leland (*ib.* pp. 471–99) repeats the appellation in quotations 'owte of a booke of chroniques in Peter College Library.' This 'booke' is a transcript from a copy of Caxton's 'Chronile,' with the continuation by Dr. John Warkworth, master of the college, 1473–98 (edited by Halliwell for the Camden Society, and also printed in a

modernised text in 'Chron. of the White Rose,' pp. 101 sq.) The manuscript has Warkworth's autograph, 'monitum,' but on examination is found not to contain the words 'Black Prince.' Other early writers who give Edward his well-known title are: Grafton (1563), who writes (*Chronicle*, p. 324, printed 1569), 'Edward, prince of Wales, who was called the blacke prince;' Holinshed (iii. 348, *b.* 20); Shakespeare, 'Henry V,' II. iv. 56; and in Speed. Barnes, 'History of Edward III' (1688), p. 363, says: 'From this time the French began to call him Le Neoir or the Black Prince,' and gives a reference which implies that the appellation is found in a record of 2 Richard II, but his reference does not appear sufficiently clear to admit of verification. The name does not occur in the 'Eulogium,' the 'Chronicle' of Geoffrey le Baker, the 'Chronicon Angliæ,' the 'Polychronicon' of Higden or of Trevisa, or in Caxton's 'Chronile' (1482), nor is it used by Jehan le Bel or Froissart. Jehan de Wavrin (*d.*1474?), who expounds a prophecy of Merlin as applying to the prince, says that he was called 'Pie-de-Plomb' (*Croniques d'Engleterre*, t. i. l. ii. c. 56, Rolls ed. i. 236). Louandre (*Hist. d'Abbeville*, p. 230) asserts that before the battle Edward arrayed his son in black armour, and it seems that the prince used black in his heraldic devices (NICHOLS, *Royal Wills*, p. 66). It is evident from the notices of the sixteenth-century historians that when they wrote the name was traditional (the subject is discussed in Dr. Murray's 'New English Dictionary,' art. 'Black Prince,' pt. iii. col. ii. p. 895; compare the 'Antiquary,' vol. xvii. No. 100, p. 183). As regards the story that the prince took the crest of three ostrich feathers and the motto 'Ich dien' from the king of Bohemia, who was slain in the battle of Crécy, it may be noted, first, as to the ostrich feathers, that in the manuscript of John of Arderne's [q. v.] 'Medica,' written by William Seton (*Sloane MS.* 56, f. 74, 14th cent.), is an ostrich feather used as a mark of reference to a previous page, on which the same device occurs, 'ubi depingitur penna principis Walliæ,' with the remark: 'Et nota quod talem pennam albam portabat Edwardus, primogenitus E. regis Angliæ, super cristam suam, et illam pennam conquisivit de Rege Boemiæ, quem interfecit apud Cresy in francia' (see also J. DE ARDERNE, 'Miscellanea medica et chirurgica,' in *Sloane MS.* 335, f. 68, 14th cent.; but not, as asserted in *Notes and Queries*, 2nd ser. xi. 293, in Arderne's 'Practice,' *Sloane MS.* 76, f. 61, written in English 15th cent.) Although the reference and remark in Sloane MS. 56 may be by Seton and not by Arderne, the prince's physician, it is evident that probably before the prince's death the ostrich feather was recognised as his peculiar badge, assumed after the battle of Crécy. While the crest of John of Bohemia was the entire wings of a vulture 'besprinkled with linden leaves of gold' (poem in Baron Reiffenburg's BARANTE, *Ducs de Bourgogne*; OLIVIER DE VRÉE, *Généalogie des Comtes de Flandre*, pp. 65–7), the ostrich seems to have been the badge of his house; it was borne by Queen Anne of Bohemia, as well as by her brother Wenzel, and is on her effigy on her tomb (*Archæologia*, xxix. 32–59). The feather badge occurs as two feathers on four seals of the prince (*ib.* xxxi. 361), and as three feathers on the alternate escutcheons placed on his tomb in accordance with the directions of his will. The prince in his will says that the feathers were 'for peace,' i.e. for jousts and tournaments, and calls them his badge, not his crest. Although the ostrich feather was his special badge, it was placed on some plate belonging to his mother, was used in the form of one or more feathers by various members of the royal house, and, by grant of Richard II, by Thomas Mowbray, duke of Norfolk (*ib.* 354–79). The story of the prince's winning the feathers was printed, probably for the first time, by Camden in his 'Remaines.' In his first edition (1605) he states that it was 'at the battle of Poictiers,' p. 161, but corrects this in his next edition (1614), p. 214. Secondly, as to the motto, it appears that the prince used two mottoes, 'Houmout' and 'Ich dien,' which are both appended as signature to a letter under his privy seal (*Archæologia*, xxxi. 381). In his will he directed that 'Houmout' should be written on each of the escutcheons round his tomb. But it actually occurs only over the escutcheons bearing his arms, while over the alternate escutcheons with his badge, and also on the escroll upon the quill of each feather, are the words 'ich diene' (*sic*). 'Houmout' is interpreted as meaning high mood or courage (*ib.* xxxii. 69). No early tradition connects 'Ich dien' with John of Bohemia. Like 'Houmout,' it is probably old Flemish or Low German. Camden in his 'Remaines' (in the passage cited above) says that it is old English, 'Ic dien,' that is 'I serve,' and that the prince 'adjoyned' the motto to the feathers, and he connects it, no doubt rightly, with the prince's position as heir, referring to Ep. to Galatians, iv. 1.

The prince was present at the siege of Calais, and after the surrender of the town harried and burned the country for thirty miles round, and brought much booty back with him (KNIGHTON, c. 2595). He returned to England with his father on 12 Oct. 1347,

took part in the jousts and other festivities of the court, and was invested by the king with the new order of the Garter. He shared in the king's chivalrous expedition to Calais in the last days of 1349, came to the rescue of his father, and when the combat was over and the king and his prisoners sat down to feast, he and the other English knights served the king and his guests at the first course and then sat down to meat at another table (Froissart, iv. 82). When the king embarked at Winchelsea on 28 Aug. 1350 to intercept the fleet of La Cerda, the prince sailed with him, though in another ship, and in company with his brother, the young Earl of Richmond (John of Gaunt). His ship was grappled by a large Spanish ship and was so full of leaks that it was likely to sink, and though he and his knights attacked the enemy manfully, they were unable to take her. The Earl of Lancaster came to his rescue and attacked the Spaniard on the other side; she was soon taken, her crew were thrown into the sea, and as the prince and his men got on board her their own ship foundered (*ib.* p. 95; Nicolas, *Royal Navy*, ii. 112). In 1353 some disturbances seem to have broken out in Cheshire, for the prince as earl marched with the Duke of Lancaster to the neighbourhood of Chester to protect the justices, who were holding an assize there. The men of the earldom offered to pay him a heavy fine to bring the assize to an end, but when they thought they had arranged matters the justices opened an inquisition of trailbaston, took a large sum of money from them, and seized many houses and much land into the prince's, their earl's, hands. On his return from Chester the prince is said to have passed by the abbey of Dieulacres in Staffordshire, to have seen a noble church which his grandfather, Edward I, had built there, and to have granted five hundred marks, a tenth of the sum he had taken from his earldom, towards its completion; the abbey was almost certainly not Dieulacres but Vale Royal (Knighton, c. 2606; *Monasticon*, v. 626, 704; Barnes, p. 468).

When Edward determined to renew the war with France in 1355, he ordered the prince to lead an army into Aquitaine while he, as his plan was, acted with the king of Navarre in Normandy, and the Duke of Lancaster upheld the cause of Montfort in Brittany. The prince's expedition was made in accordance with the request of some of the Gascon lords who were anxious for plunder. On 10 July the king appointed him his lieutenant in Gascony, and gave him powers to act in his stead, and, on 4 Aug., to receive homages (*Fœdera*, iii. 302, 312). He left London for Plymouth on 30 June, was detained there by contrary winds, and set sail on 8 Sept. with about three hundred ships, in company with the Earls of Warwick, Suffolk, Salisbury, and Oxford, and in command of a thousand men-at-arms, two thousand archers, and a large body of Welsh foot (Avesbury, p. 201). At Bordeaux the Gascon lords received him with much rejoicing. It was decided to make a short campaign before the winter, and on 10 Oct. he set out with fifteen hundred lances, two thousand archers, and three thousand light foot. Whatever scheme of operations the king may have formed during the summer, this expedition of the prince was purely a piece of marauding. After grievously harrying the counties of Juliac, Armagnac, Astarac, and part of Comminges, he crossed the Garonne at Ste.-Marie a little above Toulouse, which was occupied by the Count of Armagnac and a considerable force. The count refused to allow the garrison to make a sally, and the prince passed on, stormed and burnt Mont Giscar, where many men, women, and children were ill-treated and slain (Froissart, iv. 163, 373), and took and pillaged Avignonet and Castelnaudary. All the country was rich, and the people 'good, simple, and ignorant of war,' so the prince took great spoil, especially of carpets, draperies, and jewels, for 'the robbers' spared nothing, and the Gascons who marched with him were specially greedy (Jehan le Bel, ii. 188; Froissart, iv. 165). Carcassonne was taken and sacked, but he did not take the citadel, which was strongly situated and fortified. Ourmes (or Homps, near Narbonne) and Trèbes bought off his army. He plundered Narbonne and thought of attacking the citadel, for he heard that there was much booty there, but gave up the idea on finding that it was well defended. While he was there a messenger came to him from the papal court, urging him to allow negotiations for peace. He replied that he could do nothing without knowing his father's will (Avesbury, p. 215). From Narbonne he turned to march back to Bordeaux. The Count of Armagnac tried to intercept him, but a small body of French having been defeated in a skirmish near Toulouse the rest of the army retreated into the city, and the prince returned in peace to Bordeaux, bringing back with him enormous spoils. The expedition lasted eight weeks, during which the prince only rested eleven days in all the places he visited, and without performing any feat of arms did the French king much mischief (letter of Sir John Wingfield, Avesbury, p. 222). During the next month, before 21 Jan. 1356, the leaders under his command reduced five towns

and seventeen castles (another letter of Sir J. Wingfield, *ib.* p. 224).

On 6 July the prince set out on another expedition, undertaken with the intention of passing through France to Normandy, and there giving aid to his father's Norman allies, the party headed by the king of Navarre and Geoffrey Harcourt. In Normandy he expected, he says, to be met by his father (letter of the prince dated 20 Oct., *Archæologia*, i. 212; Froissart, iv. 196). He crossed the Dordogne at Bergerac on 4 Aug. (for itinerary of this expedition see *Eulogium*, iii. 215 sq.), and rode through Auvergne, Limousin, and Berry, plundering and burning as he went until he came to Bourges, where he burnt the suburbs but failed to take the city. He then turned westward and made an unsuccessful attack on Issoudun, 25–7 Aug. Meanwhile King John was gathering a large force at Chartres, whence he was able to defend the passages of the Loire, and was sending troops to the fortresses that seemed in danger of attack. From Issoudun the prince returned to his former line of march and took Vierzon. There he learnt that it would be impossible for him to cross the Loire or to form a junction with Lancaster, who was then in Brittany. Accordingly he determined to return to Bordeaux by way of Poitiers, and after putting to death most of the garrison of the castle of Vierzon set out on the 29th towards Romorantin. Some French knights who skirmished with his advanced guard retreated into that place, and when he heard it he said: 'Let us go there; I should like to see them a little nearer.' He inspected the fortress in person and sent his friend Chandos to summon the garrison to surrender. The place was defended by Boucicault and other leaders, and on their refusing his summons he assaulted it on the 31st. The siege lasted three days, and the prince, who was enraged at the death of one of his friends, declared that he would not leave the place untaken. Finally he set fire to the roofs of the fortress by using Greek fire, reduced it on 3 Sept., and on the 5th proceeded on his march through Berry. On the 9th King John, who had now gathered a large force, crossed the Loire at Blois and went in pursuit of him. When the king was at Loches on the 12th he had as many as twenty thousand men-at-arms, and with these and his other forces he advanced to Chauvigny. On the 16th and 17th his army crossed the Vienne. Meanwhile the prince was marching almost parallel to the French and at only a few miles distance from them. It is impossible to believe Froissart's statement that he was ignorant of the movements of the French. From the 14th to the 16th he was at Châtelherault, and on the next day, Saturday, as he was marching towards Poitiers, some French men-at-arms skirmished with his advance guard, pursued them up to the main body of his army, and were all slain or taken prisoners. The French king had outstripped him, and his retreat was cut off by an army at least fifty thousand strong, while he had not, it is said, more than about two thousand men-at-arms, four thousand archers, and fifteen hundred light foot. Lancaster had endeavoured to come to his relief, but had been stopped by the French at Pont-de-Cé (*Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin*, p. 7). When the prince knew that the French army lay between him and Poitiers, he took up his position on some rising ground to the south-east of the city, between the right bank of the Miausson and the old Roman road, probably on a spot now called La Cardinerie, a farm in the commune of Beauvoir, for the name Maupertuis has long gone out of use, and remained there that night. The next day, Sunday, the 18th, the cardinal, Hélie Talleyrand, called 'of Périgord,' obtained leave from John to endeavour to make peace. The prince was willing enough to come to terms, and offered to give up all the towns and castles he had conquered, to set free all his prisoners, and not to serve against the king of France for seven years, besides, it is said, offering a payment of a hundred thousand francs. King John, however, was persuaded to demand that the prince and a hundred of his knights should surrender themselves up as prisoners, and to this he would not consent. The cardinal's negotiations lasted the whole day, and were protracted in the interest of the French, for John was anxious to give time for further reinforcements to join his army. Considering the position in which the prince then was, it seems probable that the French might have destroyed his little army simply by hemming it in with a portion of their host, and so either starving it or forcing it to leave its strong station and fight in the open with the certainty of defeat. Anyway John made a fatal mistake in allowing the prince the respite of Sunday; for while the negotiations were going forward he employed his army in strengthening its position. The English front was well covered by vines and hedges; on its left and rear was the ravine of the Miausson and a good deal of broken ground, and its right was flanked by the wood and abbey of Nouaillé. All through the day the army was busily engaged in digging trenches and making fences, so that it stood, as at Crécy, in a kind of entrenched camp (Froissart, v. 29; Matt. Villani, vii. c. 16). The prince drew up his men in three divisions, the first

being commanded by Warwick and Suffolk, the second by himself, and the rear by Salisbury and Oxford. The French were drawn up in four divisions, one behind the other, and so lost much of the advantage of their superior numbers. In front of his first line and on either side of the narrow lane that led to his position the prince stationed his archers, who were well protected by hedges, and posted a kind of ambush of three hundred men-at-arms and three hundred mounted archers, who were to fall on the flank of the second battle of the enemy, commanded by the Duke of Normandy. At daybreak on the 19th the prince addressed his little army, and the fight began. An attempt was made by three hundred picked men-at-arms to ride through the narrow lane and force the English position, but they were shot down by the archers. A body of Germans and the first division of the army which followed were thrown into disorder; then the English force in ambush charged the second division on the flank, and as it began to waver the English men-at-arms mounted their horses, which they had kept near them, and charged down the hill. The prince kept Chandos by his side, and his friend did him good service in the fray [see CHANDOS, SIR JOHN]. As they prepared to charge he cried: 'John, get forward; you shall not see me turn my back this day, but I will be ever with the foremost,' and then he shouted to his banner-bearer, 'Banner, advance, in the name of God and St. George!' All the French except the advance guard fought on foot, and the division of the Duke of Normandy, already wavering, could not stand against the English charge and fled in disorder. The next division, under the Duke of Orleans, also fled, though not so shamefully, but the rear, under the king in person, fought with much gallantry. The prince, 'who had the courage of a lion, took great delight that day in the fight.' The combat lasted till a little after 3 P.M., and the French, who were utterly defeated, left eleven thousand dead on the field, of whom 2,426 were men of gentle birth. Nearly a hundred counts, barons, and bannerets and two thousand men-at-arms, besides many others, were made prisoners, and the king and his youngest son, Philip, were among those who were taken. The English loss was not large. When the king was brought to him the prince received him with respect, helped him to take off his armour, and entertained him and the greater part of the princes and barons who had been made prisoners at supper. He served at the king's table and would not sit down with him, declaring that 'he was not worthy to sit at table with so great a king or so valiant a man,' and speaking many comfortable words to him, for which the French praised him highly (FROISSART, v. 64, 288). The next day the prince continued his retreat on Bordeaux; he marched warily, but no one ventured to attack him. At Bordeaux, which he reached on 2 Oct., he was received with much rejoicing, and he and his men tarried there through the winter and wasted in festivities the immense spoil they had gathered. On 23 March 1357 he concluded a two years' truce, for he wished to return home. The Gascon lords were unwilling that the king should be carried off to England, and he gave them a hundred thousand crowns to silence their murmurs. He left the country under the government of four Gascon lords and arrived in England on 4 May, after a voyage of eleven days, landing at Plymouth (KNIGHTON, c. 2615; *Eulogium*, iii. 227; WALSINGHAM, i. 283; *Fœdera*, iii. 348, not at Sandwich as FROISSART, v. 82). When he entered London in triumph on the 24th, the king, his prisoner, rode a fine white charger, while he was mounted on a little black hackney. Judged by modern ideas the prince's show of humility appears affected, and the Florentine chronicler remarks that the honour done to King John must have increased the misery of the captive and magnified the glory of King Edward; but this comment argues a refinement of feeling which neither Englishmen nor Frenchmen of that day had probably attained (MATT. VILLANI, vii. c. 66).

After his return to England the prince took part in the many festivals and tournaments of his father's court, and in May 1359 he and the king and other challengers held the lists at a joust proclaimed at London by the mayor and sheriffs, and, to the great delight of the citizens, the king appeared as the mayor and the prince as the senior sheriff (BARNES, p. 564). Festivities of this sort and the lavish gifts he bestowed on his friends brought him into debt, and on 27 Aug., when a new expedition into France was being prepared, the king granted that if he fell his executors should have his whole estate for four years for the payment of his debts (*Fœdera*, iii. 445). In October he sailed with the king to Calais, and led a division of the army during the campaign that followed [see under EDWARD III]. At its close he took the principal part on the English side in negotiating the treaty of Bretigny, and the preliminary truce arranged at Chartres on 7 May 1360 was drawn up by proctors acting in his name and the name of the regent of France (*ib.* iii. 486; CHANDOS, l. 1539). He probably did not return to England until after his father (JAMES, ii. 223 *n.*), who landed at Rye on

18 May. On 9 July he and Henry, duke of Lancaster, landed at Calais in attendance on the French king. As, however, the stipulated instalment of the king's ransom was not ready, he returned to England, leaving John in charge of Sir Walter Manny and three other knights (Froissart, vi. 24). He accompanied his father to Calais on 9 Oct. to assist at the liberation of King John and the ratification of the treaty, rode with John to Boulogne, where he made his offering in the Church of the Virgin, and returned with his father to England at the beginning of November. On 10 Oct. 1361 the prince, who was then in his thirty-first year, married his cousin Joan, countess of Kent, daughter of Edmund of Woodstock, earl of Kent, younger son of Edward I, by Margaret, daughter of Philip III of France, and widow of Thomas lord Holland, and in right of his wife earl of Kent, then in her thirty-third year, and the mother of three children. As the prince and the countess were related in the third degree, and also by the spiritual tie of sponsorship, the prince being godfather to Joan's elder son Thomas, a dispensation was obtained for their marriage from Innocent VI, though they appear to have been contracted before it was applied for (*Fœdera*, iii. 626). The marriage was performed at Windsor, in the presence of the king, by Simon, archbishop of Canterbury. It is said that the marriage —that is, no doubt, the contract of marriage —was entered into without the knowledge of the king (Froissart, vi. 275, Amiens). The prince and his wife resided at Berkhampstead in Hertfordshire. On 19 July 1362 the king granted him all his dominions in Aquitaine and Gascony, to be held as a principality by liege homage on payment of an ounce of gold each year, together with the title of Prince of Aquitaine and Gascony (*Fœdera*, iii. 667). During the rest of the year he was occupied in preparing for his departure to his new principality, and after Christmas he received the king and his court at Berkhampstead, took leave of his father and mother, and in the following February sailed with his wife and all his household for Gascony, and landed at Rochelle. There he was met by Chandos, the king's lieutenant, and proceeded with him to Poitiers, where he received the homage of the lords of Poitou and Saintonge; he then rode to various cities and at last came to Bordeaux, where from 9 to 30 July he received the homage of the lords of Gascony. He received all graciously, and kept a splendid court, residing sometimes at Bordeaux and sometimes at Angoulême. He appointed Chandos constable of Guyenne, and provided the knights of his household with profitable offices. They kept much state, and their extravagance displeased the people (Froissart, vi. 82). Many of the Gascon lords were dissatisfied at being handed over to the dominion of the English, and the favour the prince showed to his own countrymen, and the ostentatious magnificence they exhibited, increased this feeling of dissatisfaction. The lord of Albret and many more were always ready to give what help they could to the French cause, and the Count of Foix, though he visited the prince on his first arrival, was thoroughly French at heart, and gave some trouble in 1365 by refusing to do homage for Bearn (*Fœdera*, iii. 779). Charles V, who succeeded to the throne of France in April 1364, was careful to encourage the malcontents, and the prince's position was by no means easy. In April 1363 the prince mediated between the Counts of Foix and Armagnac, who had for a long time been at war with each other. He also attempted in the following February to mediate between Charles of Blois and John of Montfort, the rival competitors for the duchy of Brittany. Both appeared before him at Poitiers, but his mediation was unsuccessful. The next month he entertained the king of Cyprus at Angoulême, and held a tournament there. At the same time he and his lords excused themselves from assuming the cross. During the summer the lord of Albret was at Paris, and his forces and several other Gascon lords upheld the French cause in Normandy against the party of Navarre. Meanwhile war was renewed in Brittany; the prince allowed Chandos to raise and lead a force to succour the party of Montfort, and Chandos won the battle of Auray against the French.

As the leaders of the free companies which desolated France were for the most part Englishmen or Gascons, they did not ravage Aquitaine, and the prince was suspected, probably not without cause, of encouraging, or at least of taking no pains to discourage, their proceedings (Froissart, vi. 183). Accordingly on 14 Nov. 1364 Edward called upon him to restrain their ravages (*Fœdera*, iii. 754). In 1365 these companies, under Sir Hugh Calveley [q. v.] and other leaders, took service with Du Guesclin, who employed them in 1366 in compelling Peter of Castile to flee from his kingdom, and in setting up his bastard brother, Henry of Trastamare, as king in his stead. Peter, who was in alliance with King Edward, sent messengers to the prince asking his help, and on receiving a gracious answer at Corunna, set out at once, and arrived at Bayonne with his son and his three daughters. The prince met him at Cap Breton, and rode with him to Bordeaux. Many

of his lords, both English and Gascon, were unwilling that he should espouse Peter's cause, but he declared that it was not fitting that a bastard should inherit a kingdom, or drive out his lawfully born brother, and that no king or king's son ought to suffer such a despite to royalty; nor could any turn him from his determination to restore the king. Peter won friends by declaring that he would make Edward's son king of Galicia, and would divide his riches among those who helped him. A parliament was held at Bordeaux, in which it was decided to ask the wishes of the English king. Edward replied that it was right that his son should help Peter, and the prince held another parliament at which the king's letter was read. Then the lords agreed to give their help, provided that their pay was secured to them. In order to give them the required security, the prince agreed to lend Peter whatever money was necessary. He and Peter then held a conference with Charles of Navarre at Bayonne, and agreed with him to allow their troops to pass through his dominions. In order to persuade him to do this, Peter had, besides other grants, to pay him 56,000 florins, and this sum was lent him by the prince. On 23 Sept. a series of agreements were entered into between the prince, Peter, and Charles of Navarre, at Libourne, on the Dordogne, by which Peter covenanted to put the prince in possession of the province of Biscay and the territory and fortress of Castro de Urdialès as pledges for the repayment of this debt, to pay 550,000 florins for six months' wages at specified dates, 250,000 florins being the prince's wages, and 300,000 florins the wages of the lords who were to serve in the expedition. He consented to leave his three daughters in the prince's hands as hostages for the fulfilment of these terms, and further agreed that whenever the king, the prince, or their heirs, the kings of England, should march in person against the Moors, they should have the command of the van before all other christian kings, and that if they were not present the banner of the king of England should be carried in the van side by side with the banner of Castile (*ib.* iii. 799–807). The prince received a hundred thousand francs from his father out of the ransom of the late king of France (*ib.* p. 787), and broke up his plate to help to pay the soldiers he was taking into his pay. While his army was assembling he remained at Angoulême, and was there visited by Peter (Ayala; Chandos). He then stayed over Christmas at Bordeaux, for his wife was there brought to bed of her second son Richard. He left Bordeaux early in February, and joined his army at Dax, where he remained three days, and received a reinforcement of four hundred men-at-arms and four hundred archers sent out by his father under his brother John, duke of Lancaster. From Dax he advanced by St. Jean-Pied-de-Port through Roncesvalles to Pamplona. When Calveley and other English and Gascon leaders of free companies found that he was about to fight for Peter, they threw up the service of Henry of Trastamare, and joined him 'because he was their natural lord' (Ayala, xviii. 2). While he was at Pamplona he received a letter of defiance from Henry (Froissart, vii. 10). From Pamplona he marched by Arruiz to Salvatierra, which opened its gates to his army, and thence advanced to Vittoria, intending to march on Burgos by this direct route. A body of his knights, which he had sent out to reconnoitre under Sir William Felton, was defeated by a skirmishing party, and he found that Henry had occupied some strong positions, and especially St. Domingo de la Calzada on the right of the Ebro, and Zaldiaran on the left, which made it impossible for him to reach Burgos through Alava. Accordingly he crossed the Ebro, and encamped under the walls of Logroño. During these movements his army had suffered from want of provisions both for men and horses, and from wet and windy weather. At Logroño, however, though provisions were still scarce, they were somewhat better off, and there on 30 March the prince wrote an answer to Henry's letter. On 2 April he quitted Logroño and moved to Navarrete de Rioja. Meanwhile Henry and his French allies had encamped at Nájara, so that the two armies were now near each other. Letters passed between Henry and the prince, for Henry seems to have been anxious to make terms. He declared that Peter was a tyrant, and had shed much innocent blood, to which the prince replied that the king had told him that all the persons he had slain were traitors. The next morning the prince's army marched from Navarrete, and all dismounted while they were yet some distance from Henry's army. The van, in which were three thousand men-at-arms, both English and Bretons, was led by Lancaster, Chandos, Calveley, and Clisson; the right division was commanded by Armagnac and other Gascon lords; the left, in which some German mercenaries marched with the Gascons, by the Captal de Buch and the Count of Foix; and the rear or main battle by the prince, with three thousand lances, and with the prince was Peter and, a little on his right, the dethroned king of Majorca and his company; the numbers, however, are scarcely to be depended

on. Before the battle began the prince prayed aloud to God that as he had come that day to uphold the right and reinstate a disinherited king, God would grant him success. Then, after telling Peter that he should know that day whether he should have his kingdom or not, he cried: 'Advance, banner, in the name of God and St. George; and God defend our right.' The knights of Castile pressed his van sorely, but the wings of Henry's army behaved ill, and would not move, so that the Gascon lords were able to attack the main body on the flanks. Then the prince brought the main body of his army into action, and the fight became hot, for he had under him 'the flower of chivalry, and the most famous warriors in the whole world.' At length Henry's van gave way, and he fled from the field (Ayala, xviii. c. 23; Froissart, vii. 37; Chandos, l. 3107 sq.; Du Guesclin, p. 49). When the battle was over the prince besought Peter to spare the lives of those who had offended him. Peter assented, with the exception of one notorious traitor, whom he at once put to death, and he also had two others slain the next day. Among the prisoners was the French marshal Audeneham, whom the prince had formerly taken prisoner at Poitiers, and whom he had released on his giving his word that he would not bear arms against him until his ransom was paid. When the prince saw him he reproached him bitterly, and called him 'liar and traitor.' Audeneham denied that he was either, and the prince asked him whether he would submit to the judgment of a body of knights. To this Audeneham agreed, and after he had dined the prince chose twelve knights, four English, four Gascons, and four Bretons, to judge between himself and the marshal. After he had stated his case, Audeneham replied that he had not broken his word, for the army the prince led was not his own; he was merely in the pay of Peter. The knights considered that this view of the prince's position was sound, and gave their verdict for Audeneham (Ayala).

On 5 April the prince and Peter marched to Burgos, and there kept Easter. The prince, however, did not take up his quarters in the city, but camped outside the walls at the monastery of Las Helgas. Peter did not pay him any of the money he owed him, and he could get nothing from him except a solemn renewal of his bond of the previous 23 Sept., which he made on 2 May before the high altar of the cathedral of Burgos (*Fœdera*, iii. 825). By this time the prince began to suspect his ally of treachery. Peter had no intention of paying his debts, and when the prince demanded possession of Biscay told him that the Biscayans would not consent to be handed over to him. In order to get rid of his creditor he told him that he could not get money at Burgos, and persuaded the prince to take up his quarters at Valladolid while he went to Seville, whence he declared he would send the money he owed. The prince remained at Valladolid during some very hot weather, waiting in vain for his money. His army suffered so terribly from dysentery and other diseases that it is said that scarcely one Englishman out of five ever saw England again (Knighton, c. 2629). He was himself seized with a sickness from which he never thoroughly recovered, and which some said was caused by poison (Walsingham, i. 305). Food and drink were scarce, and the free companies in his pay did much mischief to the surrounding country (Chandos, l. 3670 sq.) Meanwhile Henry of Trastamare made war upon Aquitaine, took Bagnères and wasted the country. Fearing that Charles of Navarre would not allow him to return through his dominions, the prince negotiated with the king of Aragon for a passage for his troops. The king made a treaty with him, and when Charles of Navarre heard of it he agreed to allow the prince, the Duke of Lancaster, and some of their lords to pass through his country; so they returned through Roncesvalles, and reached Bordeaux early in September. Some time after he had returned the companies, some six thousand strong, also reached Aquitaine, having passed through Aragon. As they had not received the whole of the money the prince had agreed to pay them, they took up their quarters in his country and began to do much mischief. He persuaded the captains to leave Aquitaine, and the companies under their command crossed the Loire and did much damage to France. This greatly angered Charles V, who about this time did the prince serious mischief by encouraging disaffection among the Gascon lords. When the prince was gathering his army for his Spanish expedition, the lord of Albret agreed to serve with a thousand lances. Considering, however, that he had at least as many men as he could find provisions for, the prince on 8 Dec. 1366 wrote to him requesting that he would bring two hundred lances only. The lord of Albret was much incensed at this, and, though peace was made by his uncle the Count of Armagnac, did not forget the offence, and Froissart speaks of it as the 'first cause of hatred between him and the prince.' A more powerful cause of this lord's discontent was the non-payment of an annual pension which had been granted him by Edward. About this time he agreed to marry

Margaret of Bourbon, sister of the queen of France. The prince was much vexed at this, and, his temper probably being soured by sickness and disappointment, behaved with rudeness to both D'Albret and his intended bride. On the other hand, Charles offered the lord the pension which he had lost, and thus drew him and his uncle, the Count of Armagnac, altogether over to the French side. The immense cost of the late campaign and his constant extravagance had brought the prince into difficulties, and as soon as he returned to Bordeaux he called an assembly of the estates of Aquitaine to meet at St. Emilion in order to obtain a grant from them. It seems as though no business was done then, for in January 1368 he held a meeting of the estates at Angoulême, and there prevailed on them to allow him a *fouage*, or hearth-tax, of ten sous for five years. An edict for this tax was published on 25 Jan. The chancellor, John Harewell, held a conference at Niort, at which he persuaded the barons of Poitou, Saintonge, Limousin, and Rouergue to agree to this tax, but the great vassals of the high marches refused, and on 30 June and again on 25 Oct. the Counts of Armagnac, Périgord, and Comminges, and the lord of Albret laid their complaints before the king of France, declaring that he was their lord paramount (Froissart, i. 548 *n.*, Buchon). Meanwhile the prince's friend Chandos, who strongly urged him against imposing this tax, had retired to his Norman estate.

Charles took advantage of these appeals, and on 25 Jan. 1369 sent messengers to the prince, who was then residing at Bordeaux, summoning him to appear in person before him in Paris and there receive judgment. He replied: 'We will willingly attend at Paris on the day appointed since the king of France sends for us, but it shall be with our helmet on our head and sixty thousand men in our company.' He caused the messengers to be imprisoned, and in revenge for this the Counts of Périgord and Comminges and other lords set on the high-steward of Rouergue, slew many of his men, and put him to flight. The prince sent for Chandos, who came to his help, and some fighting took place, though war was not yet declared. His health was now so feeble that he could not take part in active operations, for he was swollen with dropsy and could not ride. By 18 March more than nine hundred towns, castles, and other places signified in one way or another their adherence to the French cause (Froissart, vii. Pref. p. lviii). He had already warned his father of the intentions of the French king, but there was evidently a party at Edward's court that was jealous of his power, and his warnings were slighted. In April, however, war was declared. Edward sent the Earls of Cambridge and Pembroke to his assistance, and Sir Robert Knolles, who now again took service with him, added much to his strength. The war in Aquitaine was desultory, and, though the English maintained their ground fairly in the field, every day that it was prolonged weakened their hold on the country. On 1 Jan. 1370 the prince sustained a heavy loss in the death of his friend Chandos. Several efforts were made by Edward to conciliate the Gascon lords [see under Edward III], but they were fruitless and can only have served to weaken the prince's authority. It is probable that John of Gaunt was working against him at the English court, and when he was sent out in the summer to help his brother, he came with such extensive powers that he almost seemed as though he had come to supersede him. In the spring Charles raised two large armies for the invasion of Aquitaine; one, under the Duke of Anjou, was to enter Guyenne by La Reole and Bergerac, the other, under the Duke of Berry, was to march towards Limousin and Queray, and both were to unite and besiege the prince in Angoulême. Ill as he was, the prince left his bed of sickness (Chandos, l. 4043) and gathered an army at Cognac, where he was joined by the Barons of Poitou and Saintonge, and the Earls of Cambridge, Lancaster, and Pembroke. The two French armies gained many cities, united and laid siege to Limoges, which was treacherously surrendered to them by the bishop, who had been one of the prince's trusted friends. When the prince heard of the surrender, he swore 'by the soul of his father' that he would have the place again and would make the inhabitants pay dearly for their treachery. He set out from Cognac with an army of twelve hundred lances, a thousand archers, and three thousand foot. His sickness was so great that he was unable to mount his horse, and was carried in a litter. The success of the French in Aquitaine was checked about this time by the departure of Du Guesclin, who was summoned to the north to stop the ravages of Sir Robert Knolles. Limoges made a gallant defence, and the prince determined to take it by undermining the walls. His mines were constantly countermined by the garrison, and it was not until the end of October, after a month's siege, that his miners succeeded in demolishing a large piece of wall which filled the ditches with its ruins. The prince ordered that no quarter should be given, and a terrible massacre took place

of persons of all ranks and ages. Many piteous appeals were made to him for mercy, but he would not hearken, and three thousand men, women, and children are said to have been put to the sword. When the bishop was brought before him, he told him that his head should be cut off, but Lancaster begged him of his brother, and so, while so many innocent persons were slain, the life of the chief offender was spared. The city was pillaged and burnt (Froissart, i. 620, Buchon; *Cont.* Murimuth, p. 209). The prince returned to Cognac; his sickness increased, and he was forced to give up all hope of being able to direct any further operations and to proceed first to Angoulême and then to Bordeaux. The death of his eldest son Edward, which happened at this time, grieved him greatly; he became worse, and his surgeon advised him to return to England. He left Aquitaine in charge of Lancaster, landed at Southampton early in January 1371, met his father at Windsor, and put a stop to a treaty the king had made the previous month with Charles of Navarre, for he would not consent to the cession of territory that Charles demanded (*Fœdera*, iii. 907), and then went to his manor of Berkhampstead, ruined alike in health and in fortune.

On his return to England the prince was probably at once recognised as the natural opponent of the influence exercised by the anti-clerical and Lancastrian party, and it is evident that the clergy trusted him; for on 2 May he met the convocation of Canterbury at the Savoy, and persuaded them to make an exceptionally large grant (Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 91). His health now began to improve, and in August 1372 he sailed with his father to the relief of Thouars; but the fleet never reached the French coast. On 5 Oct. he resigned the principality of Aquitaine and Gascony, giving as his reason that its revenues were no longer sufficient to cover expenses, and acknowledging his resignation in the parliament of the next month. At the conclusion of this parliament, after the knights had been dismissed, he met the citizens and burgesses 'in a room near the white chamber,' and prevailed on them to extend the customs granted the year before for the protection of merchant shipping for another year (*Rot. Parl.* ii. 310; Hallam, *Const. Hist.* iii. 47). It is said that after Whitsunday (20 May) 1374 the prince presided at a council of prelates and nobles held at Westminster to answer a demand from Gregory XI for a subsidy to help him against the Florentines. The bishops, after hearing the pope's letter, which asserted his right as lord spiritual, and, by the grant of John, lord in chief, of the kingdom, declared that 'he was lord of all.' The cause of the crown, however, was vigorously maintained, and the prince, provoked at the hesitation of Archbishop Wittlesey, spoke sharply to him, and at last told him that he was an ass. The bishops gave way, and it was declared that John had no power to bring the realm into subjection (*Cont. Eulogium*, iii. 337. This story, told at length by the continuator of the 'Eulogium,' presents some difficulties, and the pope's pretension to sovereignty and the answer that was decided on read like echoes of the similar incidents in 1366). The prince's sickness again became very heavy, though when the 'Good parliament' met on 28 April 1376 he was looked upon as the chief support of the commons in their attack on the abuses of the administration, and evidently acted in concert with William of Wykeham in opposing the influence of Lancaster and the disreputable clique of courtiers who upheld it, and he had good cause to fear that his brother's power would prove dangerous to the prospects of his son Richard (*Chron. Angliæ*, Pref. xxix, pp. 74, 75, 393). Richard Lyons, the king's financial agent, who was impeached for gigantic frauds, sent him a bribe of 1,000*l.* and other gifts, but he refused to receive it, though he afterwards said that it was a pity he had not kept it, and sent it to pay the soldiers who were fighting for the kingdom (*ib.* p. 80). From the time that the parliament met he knew that he was dying, and was much in prayer, and did many good and charitable works. His dysentery became very violent, and he often fainted from weakness, so that his household believed that he was actually dead. Yet he bore all his sufferings patiently, and 'made a very noble end, remembering God his Creator in his heart,' and bidding his people pray for him (*ib.* p. 88; Chandos, l. 4133). He gave gifts to all his servants, and took leave of the king his father, asking him three things, that he would confirm his gifts, pay his debts quickly out of his estate, and protect his son Richard. These things the king promised. Then he called his young son to him, and bound him under a curse not to take away the gifts he had bestowed. Shortly before he died Sir Richard Stury, one of the courtiers of Lancaster's party, came to see him. The prince reproached him bitterly for his evil deeds. Then his strength failed. In his last moments he was attended by the Bishop of Bangor, who urged him to ask forgiveness of God and of all those whom he had injured. For a while he would not do this, but at last joined his hands and prayed that God and man would grant him pardon, and so died in

his forty-sixth year. His death took place at the palace of Westminster (Walsingham, i. 321; Froissart, i. 706, Buchon; it is asserted by Caxton, in his continuation of the 'Polychronicon,' cap. 8, that the prince died at his manor of Kennington, and that his body was brought to Westminster) on 8 July, Trinity Sunday, a day he had always kept with special reverence (Chandos, l. 4201). He was buried with great state in Canterbury Cathedral on 29 Sept., and the directions contained in his will were followed at his funeral, in the details of his tomb, and in the famous epitaph placed upon it. Above it still hang his surcoat, helmet, shield, and gauntlets. He had two sons by his wife Joan: Edward, born at Angoulême on 27 July 1364 (*Eulogium*), 1365 (Murimuth), or 1363 (Froissart), died immediately before his father's return to England in January 1371, and was buried in the church of the Austin Friars, London (Weever, *Funeral Monuments*, p. 419); and Richard, who succeeded his grandfather on the throne; and it is said, two bastard sons, Sir John Sounder and Sir Roger Clarendon [q. v.]

[Barnes's Hist. of Edward III with that of the Black Prince [see under Edward III]; Collins's Life of Edward, Prince of Wales [see Collins, Arthur]; G. P. R. James's Hist. of the Life of Edward the Black Prince, 1822, eulogistic and wordy, but useful; in the edition of 1836 James defends his work from the strictures of the Athenæum; Longman's Life and Times of Edward III; Murimuth cum cont. Engl. Hist. Soc.; T. Walsingham, Eulogium Hist., and Chron. Angliæ (Rolls Ser.); Robert of Avesbury, ed. Hearne; Knighton, ed. Twysden; Stow's Annales; G. le Baker, ed. Giles; Sloane MSS. 56 and 335; Archæologia, xxix. xxxi. xxxii.; Rolls of Parliament; Rymer's Fœdera, Record ed.; Jehan le Bel, ed. Polain; Froissart, ed. Luce and ed. Buchon; Le Prince Noir, poème du Héraut Chandos, ed. Fr. Michel; Chronique de Bertrand du Guesclin, Panthéon Litt.; Istorie di Matteo Villani, Muratori, Rerum Ital. ss. xiv. For the battle of Poitiers, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest, viii. 59, xi. 76. For the Spanish campaign, Lopez de Ayala's Crónicas de los Reyes de Castilla, ed. 1779. For other references see under Edward III, in text of above art., and in the notes of M. Luce's Froissart.]

W. H.

EDWARD, Prince of Wales (1453–1471), only son of Henry VI, was born at Westminster on 13 Oct. 1453, eight years after his father's marriage with Margaret of Anjou, and the day being that of the translation of St. Edward the King and Confessor, he received the name of Edward at baptism. He was baptised by Bishop Waynfleet; Cardinal Kemp and Edmund, duke of Somerset, were his godfathers, and Anne, duchess of Buckingham, was his godmother. His father's faculties were at the time clouded by an illness which had begun in August. At the beginning of January 1454 an ineffectual attempt was made to bring the child under the unhappy parent's notice. The babe was created Prince of Wales on Whitsunday, 9 June 1454. The government meanwhile had passed from the hands of Somerset into those of the Duke of York, who was appointed protector during the king's imbecility, with a proviso that he should give up his charge to the Prince of Wales if the latter should be willing to undertake it when he attained years of discretion (*Rolls of Parl.* v. 243). But next Christmas the king recovered, and on 30 Dec. the queen again brought to him his child, now more than a twelvemonth old. He asked his name, and, being told Edward, held up his hands and thanked God. The king's recovery only led to the removal of the protector, the restoration of inefficient ministers, distrust, and civil war. The king again fell ill, and York was again protector; the king again recovered, and York was again removed. For seven years all was in confusion.

During this unsettled period the prince was continually with his mother, who tried to keep the government entirely in her own hands. It was insinuated by the Yorkists that her child was not King Henry's; while she, on the other hand, actually sounded some of the lords as to the advisability of getting her husband to resign the crown in his favour. In the spring of 1456, after York's first removal from the protectorship, she took him into the north to Tutbury, while the Yorkist lords at Sandall and Warwick kept watch to see what she would do. In 1459, when the Yorkists were for a time overthrown, a provision was made for him in parliament as Prince of Wales (*Rolls of Parl.* v. 356). In 1460 he was with his father and mother at Coventry just before the battle of Northampton; and there the king on departing for the field took leave of him and the queen, desiring the latter for her safety not to come to him again in obedience to any message, unless he sent her a secret token known only to themselves. The day was lost for Henry, and Margaret, who had withdrawn to Eccleshall, fled further with her son to Chester, and from thence into Wales, being attacked and robbed on the way, near Malpas, by a dependent of her own whom she had put in trust as an officer of some kind to the prince. The two reached Harlech Castle with only our attendants, and afterwards stole away n secret to join the king's half-brother, Jasper,

earl of Pembroke. They were in Wales in October, just before the Duke of York made his claim to the crown in parliament, which was settled at the time by a compromise that the duke should succeed on Henry's death. Prince Edward was thus disinherited; but his mother refused to recognise the parliamentary settlement, and arranged secretly with a number of friends for a great meeting at Hull. It appears, however, that she herself and her son fled from Wales by sea to Scotland, and that while the Duke of York was defeated and slain by her adherents at Wakefield on 30 Dec., they had a meeting in January with the queen widow of James II at Lincluden Abbey, near Dumfries, where they all stayed together ten or twelve days, and arranged for mutual aid against the house of York. The surrender of Berwick to the Scots had already been agreed on; and there was some negotiation for a marriage between the Prince of Wales and Princess Mary, daughter of James II (*Auchinleck Chronicle*, 21; Wavrin, ed. Dupont, ii. 301). This interview over, Margaret returned southwards with her son, and joining her already victorious followers in Yorkshire pursued her way towards London as far as St. Albans. Here they were met on 17 Feb. 1461 by the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Warwick, and others, who brought with them King Henry, virtually a prisoner in their hands; and a battle ensued (the second battle of St. Albans), in which Margaret's party was once more successful. The victors wore the prince's livery—a band of crimson and black with ostrich feathers. The king was recaptured by his wife's adherents, and made his son a knight upon the battle-field. The distinction was apparently considered due to a prince who in his eighth year had witnessed an engagement; for the only action recorded of him that day is, that after the battle he ordered Sir Thomas Kiriel to be beheaded. The queen, his mother, it is said, asked him what death was to be inflicted on Sir Thomas and his son, and the boy in answer proposed decapitation; on which the sentence was executed before both the prince and his mother (Wavrin, *Chroniques d'Engleterre*, ed. Dupont, ii. 265). Other accounts are silent about Sir Thomas Kiriel's son, and say that Kiriel died in the field, and that it was Lord Bonvile on whom the prince pronounced judgment (Gregory, *Chronicle*, 212). It was at night after the battle that, as we are told, 'the king blessed his son the prince, and Dr. Morton brought forth a book that was full of orisons, and there the book was opened, and blessed that young child "cum pinguedine terræ et cum rore cœli, and made him knight.' The lad wore a pair of brigantines covered with purple velvet, 'i-bete with goldesmythe ys worke,' and being so exalted conferred the dignity of knighthood upon others, of whom the first was Sir Andrew Trollope (*ib.* 214). Dr. Morton, who was afterwards cardinal and archbishop of Canterbury, was at this time chancellor to the young prince (*ib.* 218). But the Duke of York's son Edward came speedily to protect London against the Lancastrians. He was proclaimed king on 4 March, and pursuing the queen's forces again into Yorkshire secured his position upon the throne by the bloody victory of Towton. Margaret and her son fled once more into Scotland, this time with the king her husband in her company, though it seems that he was for a short time besieged in some Yorkshire fortress. They first reached Newcastle and then Berwick, which, according to agreement, they delivered up to the Scots. Of course they were both attainted in Edward's first parliament which met in November (*Rolls of Parl.* v. 479). In the course of that year Henry VI was at Kirkcudbright, and Margaret and her son at Edinburgh, where apparently she organised a scheme for the simultaneous invasion of England in three places, to take place at Candlemas following (*Paston Letters*, ii. 91; *Three Fifteenth-century Chronicles*, Camden Soc. 158). Nothing, however, seems to have come of this, and in April 1462 Margaret took shipping at Kirkcudbright, and sailed through the Irish Channel to Brittany, where she met with a kind reception from the duke with a gift of twelve thousand crowns, then passed on to her father in Anjou, and from him to Louis XI. Her son had certainly left Scotland with her, and was in France along with her (Richard de Wassebourg, *Antiquités de la Gaule Belgique*, f. 510). On 23 June 1462, at Chinon, she executed a bond for the delivery of Calais to the French in return for aid which she was to receive from Louis against Edward. Louis gave her a fleet with which she sailed from Normandy, again accompanied by her son, and landed again in Scotland in October. Next month she gained possession of some castles in Northumberland, but hearing of the approach of King Edward with a large force she sailed for France, but was driven back by tempest to Berwick, which she reached with difficulty after being shipwrecked off the coast. The castles were recovered by King Edward, and at the beginning of 1463 the cause of the house of Lancaster was in a more hopeless state than ever.

This was the time when Margaret and her son met with that celebrated adventure recorded by the continuator of Monstrelet,

when wandering about they lost themselves in a forest and were attacked by robbers, who stripped them of all their jewels and afterwards fought among themselves for the booty. Margaret, seizing her advantage, gave her son to one of the brigands and said, 'Here, my friend, save the son of your king!' The conclusion of the story is thus related by the chronicler: 'The brigand took him with very good will, and they departed, so that shortly after they came by sea to Sluys. And from Sluys she went to Bruges, her son still with her, where she was received very honourably, while her husband, King Henry, was in Wales, in one of the strongest places in England' (Monstrelet, iii. 96, ed. 1595). That she and her son, and her husband also when they were together, had suffered very great distress, is attested by another writer of the time, who says that the three had been once five days without any food but a herring (Chastellain, iv. 299, ed. Brussels, 1863). But a slight improvement had taken place in the fortune of war before she crossed the sea, for she sailed from Bamborough, which must have been by that time again recovered for the house of Lancaster, as it was for some months at least. On her landing at Sluys she was received by the Count of Charolois (afterwards Charles the Bold), and conducted by him to his father, Philip, duke of Burgundy, at Lille, who relieved her with money. She then went to her father, René, in Lorraine, with whom she remained for some years watching the course of events in hope of better fortune, while her husband fell into the hands of Edward and was imprisoned in the Tower. During this period she and her son the prince, residing at St. Mihiel in Barrois, received a communication from the Earl of Ormonde, who had taken refuge in Portugal, by which they were encouraged to hope that the king of Portugal would assist in restoring Henry VI to the throne; but nothing appears to have come of their efforts to engage his sympathies. In May 1467 the Duke of Milan's ambassador mentions Margaret and her son as being still in Lorraine (*Venetian Cal.* vol. i. No. 405). A letter of the French ambassador in England, dated 16 Jan. following, speaks of the great alarm excited among Edward's friends by a report that overtures had been made for the marriage of the Prince of Wales to one of Louis XI's daughters (Jehan de Wavrin, ed. Dupont, iii. 190). In 1470 the prince stood godfather to Louis's son, afterwards Charles VIII of France, who was born on 30 June at Amboise. Just after this (15 July) a meeting took place at Angers of Louis XI, Margaret of Anjou, and her father King René, the prince, and the Earl of Warwick, at which Margaret was induced to forgive the earl for his past conduct and consent to the marriage of her son with his second daughter, Anne, in order to have his assistance against Edward IV. The young lady, who was also then at Angers, was placed in Margaret's custody till the marriage should take effect, which was not to be till Warwick had recovered the kingdom, or the most part of it, for Henry; and when that took place the prince was to be regent in behalf of his father, whose incompetence to rule was now past dispute. A plan was then arranged with Louis for the immediate invasion of England, and was ratified by the oaths of the parties in St. Mary's Church at Angers.

Warwick presently sailed with the expedition, and was so successful that in October Edward IV was driven out of the kingdom and Henry VI restored. But unhappily for the Lancastrian cause, Margaret and her son forbore to cross the sea till March following, and King Edward, having set sail for England again three weeks before them, had practically recovered his kingdom by the time they set foot in it. For although they embarked at Honfleur on 24 March, and might with a favourable breeze have reached the English coast in twelve hours, they were beaten by contrary winds for seventeen days and nights, and only reached Weymouth on the evening of 14 April, the very day the battle of Barnet was fought and the Earl of Warwick slain. They proceeded to Cerne Abbey, where they learned on the 15th the news of this great reverse; but the Duke of Somerset and other friends who came thither to welcome them on their arrival encouraged them to rely on the loyalty of the western counties, which were ready to rise at once in their behalf. They accordingly issued orders for a general muster and proceeded westward to Exeter; then having collected a considerable force advanced to Bristol. King Edward was now on his way to meet them, but was uncertain whether they intended to march on London or draw northwards by the borders of Wales to Cheshire, and they contrived to deceive him as to their movements while they passed on to Gloucester, where, however, they were denied entrance by Lord Beauchamp. They were thus compelled to continue their march to Tewkesbury, where they arrived much fatigued on the afternoon of 3 May, and pitched their camp before the town in a position well secured by 'foul lanes, deep dykes, and many hedges.' The king that evening reached Cheltenham, and next morning,

4 May, coming to Tewkesbury, arranged his army for battle. They first opened fire on the enemy with ordnance and a shower of arrows, till the Duke of Somerset unwisely carried his men out of their more secure position and brought them by certain bypaths on to a hill in front of Edward's van. Here, while engaging the king's forces in front, they were suddenly attacked in flank by a detachment of two hundred spears told off by Edward before the battle to guard against a possible ambush in a wood. Thus Somerset's men were thrown into confusion, and very soon the rest of the Lancastrian forces were broken and put to flight.

The Prince of Wales had been put in nominal command of the 'middle ward' of this army, but he acted under the advice of two experienced officers, Sir John Longstruther, prior of the knights of St. John, and Lord Wenlock. When Somerset first moved from his position he seems to have reckoned on being followed by Lord Wenlock in an attack on Edward's van. But Wenlock stood still and simply looked on, till Somerset returning called him traitor and dashed his brains out with a battle-axe. Sir John Longstruther fled and took refuge in the abbey, and the Prince of Wales, flying towards the town, appealed for protection to his brother-in-law Clarence. In what may be called an official account of Edward IV's recovery of his kingdom, it is said that the prince was slain in the field; but a more detailed account written in the next generation says that he was taken prisoner by a knight named Sir Richard Croftes, who delivered him up to King Edward on the faith of a proclamation issued after the battle, that whoever brought him to the king alive or dead should have an annuity of 100*l.*, and that the prince's life should be saved. Yet the promise was shamefully violated, if not by the king himself, at least by those about him; for when the young man was brought before him Edward first inquired of him 'how he durst so presumptuously enter his realm with banner displayed?' The prince replied, 'To recover my father's kingdom,' and Edward, we are told, 'with his hand thrust him from him, or, as some say, struck him with his gauntlet,' on which the Dukes of Clarence and Gloucester, the Marquis of Dorset, and Lord Hastings, who stood by, at once assassinated him. It seems to have been regarded as a favour that the king allowed him honourable burial.

Thus fell Edward, prince of Wales, who is described as 'a goodly feminine and a well-featured young gentleman,' in the eighteenth year of his age. His intended bride, Anne Nevill, whom the writers of that day call his wife, was taken prisoner after the battle, and a little later became the wife of Richard, duke of Gloucester [see ANNE, queen of Richard III].

[An English Chronicle, ed. Davies (Camd. Soc.); Paston Letters; Wil. Wyrcester, Annales; Collections of a London Citizen (Camd. Soc.); Three Fifteenth-century Chronicles (Camd. Soc.); Burnett's Exchequer Rolls of Scotland, vol. vii. (Scotch Record Publications); Anchiennes Cronicques d'Engleterre par Jehan de Wavrin (Dupont's edit.); Registrum J. Whethamstede, ed. Riley (Rolls Series); Leland's Collectanea, ii. 498–9; Hearne's Fragment (after Sprott), 304; Hist. Croyland. Contin. in Fulman's Scriptores, i. 533, 550, 553, 555; Ellis's Letters, 2nd ser. i. 132–5; Clermont's Fortescue, i. 22–31; Fabyan's Chronicle; Hall's Chronicle; Polydore Vergil.]

J. G.

EDWARD, EARL OF WARWICK (1475–1499), was the eldest son of George, duke of Clarence, brother of Edward IV, by his wife Isabel, daughter of Richard Nevill, earl of Warwick, 'the kingmaker.' The first two children of that marriage were both daughters, of whom the eldest was born at sea in the spring of 1470 (when Lord Wenlock, commanding at Calais, would not allow his parents to land), but died an infant and was buried at Calais. The second was Margaret, born at Castle Farley, near Bath, in August 1473, who was afterwards Countess of Salisbury and fell a victim to Henry VIII's tyranny. This Edward, the first son, was born at Warwick Castle on 21 Feb. 1475. The last child, another son, named Richard, was born in 1476 and died on 1 Jan. 1477, not a quarter of a year old. He and his mother, who died shortly before him, were said to have been poisoned, for which some of the household servants of the duke and duchess were tried and put to death (*Third Report of the Dep.-Keeper of Public Records*, app. ii. 214).

As the Duke of Clarence was put to death on 18 Feb. 1478, when this Edward was barely three years old, he was left from that tender age without either father or mother, and his nearest relation, after his sister Margaret, was his aunt, Anne, duchess of Gloucester, afterwards queen by the usurpation of Richard III. How much care she bestowed upon him does not appear. The first thing we hear about him, however, is that when only eight years old King Richard knighted him along with his own son at York in 1483. Next year the usurper, having lost his only son, thought of making him his heir, but on further consideration shut him up in close confinement in Sheriff Hutton Castle, and nominated John de la Pole, earl of Lincoln, to succeed to the throne. In 1485, after the

battle of Bosworth, Henry VII sent Sir Robert Willoughby to Sheriff Hutton to bring this Edward up to London, where he was imprisoned in the Tower for the rest of his days for no other crime than being the son of Clarence.

This injustice was resented by many. It was feared from the first that the king had a design of putting the young man to death, and the partisans of the house of York eagerly spread abroad rumours that he had escaped from the Tower, or that one of the sons of Edward IV was still alive to wrest the sceptre from a usurper. Yet another rumour said that Warwick had actually died in prison, and it was probably from some belief in this report that Simnel was induced to personate the earl in Ireland in the early part of 1487. The conspiracy had been artfully got up, the news of Warwick's being in Ireland being spread at the same time in the Low Countries by the Earl of Lincoln, who escaped thither in the beginning of Lent, and professed that he had been in daily consultation with the earl at Sheen just before his departure (Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 209). The impostor was crowned in Ireland, and the air was so full of false rumours that the king found it advisable to cause the true earl one Sunday to be taken out of the Tower and pass through the streets in procession to St. Paul's, where he heard mass and publicly conversed with several other noblemen.

Warwick thus owed to his counterfeit a day's comparative liberty, and it seems to have been the last day of his life that he passed beyond the limits of the Tower. There he remained in prison for the next twelve years. Cut off from all human intercourse from his boyhood, and debarred even from the sight of common objects, it was said 'that he could not discern a goose from a capon.' Yet the mere fact that he lived must have been a cause of anxiety to Henry VII, as it had already been the cause of one Yorkist insurrection, when Perkin Warbeck appeared upon the scene and personated one of the murdered sons of Edward IV. The adventures of Perkin, however, did not tend to make Warwick more formidable, and for two years after that impostor was lodged in the Tower nothing further was done to him. But unhappily another counterfeit arose in the interval. In 1498 or early in 1499 a young man named Ralph Wilford, educated for the part by an Austin canon, repeated the performance of Simnel in personating Warwick, for which both he and his tutor were put to execution on Shrove Tuesday, 12 Feb. 1499.

A few months after this Perkin Warbeck made an attempt to corrupt his gaolers and draw them into a plot for the liberation of himself and the Earl of Warwick, who, being informed of the project, very naturally agreed to it for his own advantage. The matter, however, was soon disclosed, and Perkin and his confederates were tried and condemned at Westminster on 16 Nov. and executed at Tyburn on the 23rd. On the 21st Warwick was arraigned before the Earl of Oxford as high constable of England, not, as some writers have told us, for having attempted to break prison, but on the pretence that he had conspired with others to depose the king. Acting either on mischievous advice, or, as many supposed, in mere simplicity from his total ignorance of the world, the poor lad pleaded guilty, and was accordingly condemned to death. He was beheaded on Tower Hill on the 28th, a week after his sentence. It was reported that his death was due in great measure to Ferdinand of Spain, who refused to give his daughter to Prince Arthur as long as the succession might be disputed in behalf of the son of Clarence, and there seems some degree of truth in the statement. The Spanish ambassador's despatches show that he attached much importance to this execution (Gairdner, *Letters of Richard III and Henry VII*, i. 113–14); and many years afterwards, when Catherine of Arragon felt bitterly the cruelty of Henry VIII in seeking a divorce from her, she observed, according to Lord Bacon, 'that it was a judgment of God, for that her former marriage was made in blood, meaning that of the Earl of Warwick.'

Warwick's attainder was reversed in the following reign by statute 5 Henry VIII, c. 12, which was passed at the instance of his sister Margaret, countess of Salisbury; and the words of the petition embodied in the act are remarkable as showing how plainly the injustice of his execution was acknowledged even in those days of tyranny. 'Which Edward, most gracious sovereign lord, was always from his childhood, being of the age of eight years, until the time of his decease, remaining and kept in ward and restrained from his liberty, as well within the Tower of London as in other places, having none experience nor knowledge of the worldly policies, nor of the laws of this realm, so that, if any offence were by him done . . . it was rather by innocency than of any malicious purpose.' Indeed, the very records of his trial give us much the same impression, for they show that the ridiculous plot with which he was charged, to seize the Tower and make himself king, was put into his head by one

Robert Cleymound, evidently an informer, who was allowed to visit him in prison.

[Rows Roll, 58, 60; Jo. Rossi Historia Regum, ed. Hearne; Polydore Vergil; Hall's Chronicle; Third Report of Dep.-Keeper of Public Records, app. ii. 216; statute 19 Hen. VII, c. 34.] J. G.

EDWARD, DAFYDD (*d.* 1690). [See David, Edward.]

EDWARD, THOMAS (1814–1886), the Banff naturalist, was born at Gosport on 25 Dec. 1814, his father, a hand-loom linen weaver, being a private in the Fifeshire militia, which was temporarily stationed there. His early years were spent at Kettle, near Cupar, and at Aberdeen. From childhood he was passionately fond of animals, and brought home so many out-of-the-way creatures that he was frequently flogged and confined to the house. But even at five years old he proved utterly unmanageable. At the age of six he had been turned out of three schools in consequence of his zoological propensities. He was then set to work at a tobacco factory in Aberdeen, at fourteen-pence a week. Two years later Edward got employment at a factory two miles from Aberdeen, and his walks to and from work gave further scope to his taste for natural history. At the age of eleven he was apprenticed to a shoemaker in Aberdeen for six years, but left his service after three years, because of the cruel treatment he received. After this he worked under other employers, with intervals of eccentric expeditions, militia service (when he narrowly escaped punishment for breaking from the ranks in pursuit of a fine butterfly), and enlistment in the 60th rifles, from which his mother's entreaties and efforts got him off.

At the age of twenty Edward settled at Banff to work at his trade. He had already taken in the 'Penny Magazine' from its first issue in 1832, and found in it some information on natural history. He had learnt something from seeing pictures on Aberdeen bookstalls and stuffed animals in shop windows. At twenty-three he married a cheerful and faithful young woman named Sophia Reid, when his earnings were less than ten shillings a week. Marriage enabled him to become a collector, by giving him for the first time a place where he could keep specimens. Without friends, without a single book on natural history, not knowing the names of the creatures he found, he gained a knowledge unique in its freshness and accuracy. Every living thing had a fascination for him. He devoted numberless nights to wanderings, during which he went about or rested as one of themselves among nocturnal creatures. Wild animals for the most part moved freely about in his neighbourhood. He became acquainted with the sounds and movements of many animals which were unknown before. But he sometimes formed their acquaintance in terrific encounters, one with a polecat lasting two hours. An hour or two's sleep on open heaths, in old buildings, on rocks by the sea, was often his only rest; and his constitution was enfeebled by rheumatism caught in such expeditions. Gradually he accumulated a representative collection of animals, all stuffed or prepared by his own hands. Once a series of nearly a thousand insects, the result of four years' work, was totally destroyed by rats or mice. By 1845 he possessed nearly two thousand species of animals, besides many plants. All the cases were made by himself.

Hoping to gain a little money, Edward exhibited his collection at the Banff fair in May 1845. This was successful, and he repeated it a year after, and then resolved to exhibit at Aberdeen in August 1846. But at Aberdeen, as the professors told him, he was 'several centuries too soon.' They had neither a public museum nor a free library. He was even met with much incredulity, few believing that he could have made the collection unaided. He had spent his small funds and got into debt. Overcome by despair he one day went to the seashore to commit suicide; but the sight of an unknown bird excited him to pursue it, and drove away his resolve. At last he was compelled to sell his entire collection for 20*l.* 10*s.* to a gentleman, who stowed it in a damp place, where it went to ruin.

Returning home penniless, Edward set to work manfully at his trade, at which he was very proficient, and refrained from night expeditions throughout the succeeding winter. In the spring he resumed his old manner of life, going further afield at times, and carrying with him, to excuse his use of a gun, an elaborate certificate of harmlessness signed by sixteen magistrates. He ran many risks, got frightful falls on cliffs, was drenched in storms, and falling ill had to sell many of his newer specimens to support his family. Meanwhile some books on natural history had been lent to him by the Rev. James Smith of Monquhitter, near Banff, who persuaded him to record some of his observations. Many of his notes on natural history were inserted in the 'Banffshire Journal.' His friend Mr. Smith in 1850 began to send notices of Edward's observations to the 'Zoologist.' These included detailed accounts of the habits and behaviour of birds which remind readers of Audubon. The deaths in 1854 of both Mr. Smith and another minister, Mr. Boyd of Crimond, who had set Edward on

the task of preparing popular lectures on the rudiments of natural history, were heavy blows to Edward. He now sought some better employment in all likely directions, but could secure nothing. He had begun contributing to several natural history journals, but received no payments in return. By 1858, however, Edward had accumulated a third collection, the best he had made. Illness again prostrated him, and when he partially recovered, though remaining incapable of undergoing long and fatiguing expeditions again, a great part of his collection had to be sold. Having to abandon night wanderings and give up his gun, Edward took to marine zoology in earnest. In default of proper apparatus he devised most ingenious substitutes; and as the result of his investigations Spence Bate and Westwood's 'History of British Sessile-eyed Crustacea' enumerates twenty new species discovered by Edward, who had collected 177 species in the Moray Firth. In other branches of marine zoology Edward furnished many facts, specimens, and new species to Messrs. Gwyn Jeffreys, Alder, A. M. Norman, Jonathan Couch, and many others. He had, however, obtained no scientific recognition more important than a curatorship of the museum of the Banff Institution, at a salary of two guineas a year, until in 1866 he was elected an associate of the Linnean Society of London. The Aberdeen and the Glasgow Natural History societies followed suit; but the Banff society did not elect their notable townsman an honorary member. The society itself deservedly died in 1875. The museum being transferred to the Banff town council, Edward was continued as curator at thirteen guineas a year, but resigned the office in 1882.

A serious illness in 1868 left Edward almost incapable of following his trade, but he afterwards recovered sufficiently to resume work at home. The publication of Mr. Smiles's biography of Edward in 1876 was the means of making Edward widely known, and of making him comfortable in his latter days. Sir Joseph Hooker, P.R.S., Professors Allman and Owen, and Mr. Darwin joined in appealing to the queen on Edward's behalf. On Christmas day 1876 Edward received the welcome news of the bestowal of a civil list pension of 50*l*. On 21 March 1877 he was presented with 333*l*., largely subscribed in Aberdeen, at a meeting in the Aberdeen Song School, at which the veteran, with his faithful wife, was received with enthusiasm, and delivered a most racy speech in broad vernacular (see *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, 28 March 1877). Other donations of considerable amount were sent to him. He now entered with extraordinary zeal upon the study of botany, and collected nearly every plant in Aberdeenshire and Banffshire. When the Banffshire Field Club was established in 1880, Edward was elected one of its vice-presidents, and read before it papers on the 'Protection of Wild Birds' and on 'Our Reptiles,' which were printed by the society. Edward died on 27 April 1886. He left one son, a minister in the Scotch church, and ten daughters.

[Life by S. Smiles, 1876; Nature (1877), xv. 349–51, 439, 479, (1886) xxxiii. 609; Aberdeen Weekly Journal, 28 March 1877; Banffshire Journal, 4 May 1886.] G. T. B.

EDWARDES, Sir HERBERT BENJAMIN (1819–1868), Indian official, second son of the Rev. B. Edwardes, born at Frodesley, Shropshire, 12 Nov. 1819, was of an ancient Cambrian family, the head of which was made a baronet by Charles II. The mother dying during his infancy Edwardes was taken charge of by an aunt, and sent in his tenth year to a private school at Richmond, where he failed to distinguish himself either as a scholar or as an athlete. In 1837 he began to attend classes at King's College, London, where also he made but moderate progress in classics and mathematics, although more successful in modern languages and a prominent member of the debating society. He also displayed a turn for drawing and wrote English verse. Checked in a desire to enter the university of Oxford, he obtained a cadetship in the Bengal infantry by personal application to a member of the court of directors, Sir R. Jenkins. He proceeded direct to India without passing through the company's military academy, and landed in Calcutta early in 1841. An observer of that day (Lieutenant-colonel Leigh) describes him as then slight and delicate-looking, with fully formed features and an expression of bright intelligence; not given to the active amusements by which most young men of his class and nation are wont to speed the hours, but abounding in mental accomplishment and resource. He was in garrison at Karnál, then a frontier station, in July 1842, a second lieutenant in the 1st Europeans or Bengal fusiliers, now the 1st battalion royal Munster fusiliers. Although the languages of the East were not necessary to an officer so employed, Edwardes's habits of study were by this time strong, and he soon came to the front as a linguist, passing examinations in Urdu, Hindi, and Persian. In little more than three years after joining his regiment he was pronounced duly qualified for the post of 'interpreter.' The

regiment now moved to Sabathu, where he began a series of papers in a local journal, the 'Delhi Gazette,' which, under the title of 'Letters of Brahminee Bull in India to his cousin John in England,' attracted a good deal of attention among the Anglo-Indian community. Henry Lawrence, then British resident at the court of Khatmandu, was especially struck with the bold political opinions and clear high-spirited style of the young subaltern; and Sir Hugh Gough, the commander-in-chief of the Indian army, with a sagacity not always shown in such cases, selected Edwardes as a member of his personal staff. The headquarters shortly afterwards taking the field for the first Punjab campaign, Edwardes was present as an aide-de-camp to Sir Hugh at the bloody fights of Moodkee and Sobraon.

On the conclusion of the war he obtained his first civil employment. Henry Lawrence was posted at Lahore as resident British minister with the durbar, or council of regency, and in that capacity undertook the task, generous if premature, of teaching the races of the Punjab the art of self-government. Edwardes was made one of Lawrence's assistants on the request of the latter, and was deputed to carry out the undertaking in one of the outlying districts. It was early in 1847 when Edwardes began the reform of civil administration in Bunnoo (Banu, as now spelt by the Indian government), a trans-Indus valley bordering on the territory of the Afghans and mainly peopled by tribes connected with that nation. Backed by a small handy force of Sikh soldiers, he soon made his mark. The numerous fortresses scattered about the valley were demolished, roads were made, canals excavated, local feuds appeased. Fortunate so far, no doubt the young district officer owed as much to his own qualities as to opportunity; and his personal influence was soon acknowledged universally among the rough and wild, but simple, population. Similar victories of peace were at the same time being won by Abbott in Hazára, by Lumsden in the Yusafzai country, and by John Nicholson at Ráwal Pindi. But the well-spring whence this knot of remarkable men derived their inspiration was undoubtedly Lawrence, and that spring was to be closed, for the moment, by his departure for Europe. His substitute was no match for Asiatic craft and intrigue. In April 1843 the unhappy mission of Patrick Alexander Vans Agnew [q. v.] and Anderson to Multan, ending in the murder of those two officers, by the orders or connivance of Mulraj, fired latent elements of combustion. Edwardes at once grappled with the conflagration. Spontaneously, without British aid or companionship, at first without either money or material, he raised a body of armed tribesmen, and rapidly formed a fairly disciplined and faithful force. Calling to his aid the nawab, or Muhamadan prince, of the neighbouring native state of Bahawalpur, he also established communications with the officer commanding for the durbar of Lahore, Colonel van Cortlandt. On 10 June he received full permission from Lahore to act on his own judgment and responsibility. On the 18th of the same month he routed the rebel troops at Kineyri, near Dehra Gházi Khán. On 3 July, having been joined by Lake, a neighbouring district officer, and further reinforced from Baháwalpur, he inflicted on the enemy a second defeat at Sadusám, in front of Multan. The Diwán Mulráj fell back upon the town and fort, and never left their shelter until General Whish, with the Bombay column, arrived and invested the place. Edwardes took an active part in the siege that followed, and on 22 Jan. 1849 became the medium of the beaten chief's surrender. The services and sufferings of Agnew and Anderson were commemorated by a monument erected by their colleagues, 'the surviving assistants,' and the inscription was from Edwardes's pen.

Edwardes's own share in these occurrences met with swift acknowledgment. H. Lawrence, who had long since returned to India, declared that 'since the days of Clive no man had done as Edwardes.' Young, alone, untrained in military science and unversed in active war, he had organised victory and rolled back rebellion. This was, indeed, the high-water mark of Edwardes's life and fortune. Distinguished as were some of his later deeds, it is on this, most of all, that his fame must ever rest. From Sir H. Gough and from the government of India he received prompt and hearty commendation. At the instance of the board of control the queen declared him a brevet major and a companion of the Bath, honours rarely, if ever, attained by any subaltern before, and the East India Company presented him with a gold medal, struck specially for the purpose, of which the mould was immediately destroyed. In January 1850 he returned to England, and there found himself the lion of the hour. He was warmly received in his native county of Shropshire. From the university of Oxford he received the degree of D.C.L. In London and at Liverpool he was publicly entertained, and exhibited on both occasions a gift of ready and graceful oratory. In July he married Emma, daughter of James Sidney of Richmond. Before the end of the year he brought out his book, 'A Year on the Punjab Frontier,' in

which he described his adventures, not without due mention of Lake and Cortlandt, and the Prince of Baháwalpur. In the spring of 1851 he returned to India, and on arrival found a new sphere of civil duty in the deputy-commissionership of the newly created British district of Jullunder (Jalandhar). In February 1853 he was transferred to Hazára, at the western foot of the Cashmere hills, leaving Jullunder with warm praise from his local chief, Donald McLeod, and expressions of regret from the people for whom he had worked nearly two years. McLeod, a trained administrator, selected from the civil service of the north-west provinces for the commissionership, was a man likely to judge soundly, and he reported that Edwardes was the best officer with whom he had ever come in contact.

In his new post a still harder task awaited Edwardes. The Hazára hills and valleys had been ruled by James Abbott, one of the most memorable of the singular group of men who served in the Punjab at that period. He was what H. Lawrence called 'a true knight-errant,' always known among the wild highlanders of Hazára as 'uncle,' and the man who, as Edwardes wrote, had brought the district 'from utter desolation to a smiling prosperity.' Edwardes only remained long enough to found a central cantonment, which he named 'Abbottábád,' in honour of his predecessor, and then, in the month of October, removed to Peshawur, promoted to the difficult and dangerous post of commissioner in succession to the murdered Mackeson. 'In the whole range of Indian charges,' so wrote the governor-general, Dalhousie, in privately informing Edwardes of his appointment, 'I know none which is more arduous than the commissionership of Peshawur. . . . You hold the outpost of Indian empire. Your past career and your personal qualities and abilities give me assurance that I have chosen well.' For the commissioner in the trans-Indus was far more than a mere prefect. In him, besides the ordinary duties of a commissioner of division, were vested the control of the lawless mountaineers who had bidden defiance to the Moghul emperors in their day of power. And to this were further added the political relations of the British government with the amir of Afghanistán, who was still smarting from past injuries, and whose territories marched with the division for sixty rough miles.

In the discharge of the political part of his duties at Peshawur Edwardes was led to suggest to the government the propriety of a treaty with the amir, and Dalhousie was prepared to give him a free hand for the purpose. But Sir John Lawrence was the chief at Lahore, and his mind was never one that jumped at novelties. On his hesitation becoming known in Calcutta the governor-general proposed that Edwardes, while conducting the negotiations with the court of Cabul, should correspond with himself, directly and without the correspondence being transmitted, as routine and propriety alike required, through the office of the chief. Edwardes declined to avail himself of this flattering irregularity; the letters were duly sent backwards and forwards through Lawrence's office, and there can be little doubt that both the arbitrary ruler at Calcutta and the ardent representative at Peshawur lived to see the benefit of the cautious intermediary. A strict non-interference clause was ultimately introduced into the agreement, and the amir, Dost Muhamad, remained faithful to its engagements under all subsequent trials. Lawrence came, years after, to be himself governor-general, and the policy of non-intervention was continued, only to be once interrupted, down to the days of Lord Dufferin. The circumstances are equally creditable to Lawrence and to Edwardes, and did not serve to ruffle for a moment the friendliness of their mutual relations. 'All the merit of the affair,' so Lawrence wrote to Edwardes, 'whatever it may be, is yours.'

Edwardes was entirely at one with Lawrence as to the question of frontier defence. When the treaty had been concluded, Edwardes wrote to a friend: 'After the doubts and lessons of the [past] . . . I have myself arrived at the conclusion that our true military position is on our own side of the passes, just where an army must debouch upon the plain.' From this conclusion he never afterwards deviated. He remained convinced that the best protection of British Indian interests on the frontier was 'a strong, independent, and friendly Afghanistan,' and that there was a distinct feeling among the people of that country 'that the Russians are not as trustworthy as the English.' But he held this conviction without any ill-temper towards Russia, believing that the British government should come to as friendly an understanding as possible with that of the czar. In 1856 the Afghan ruler came down to Peshawur on Edwardes's suggestion, and there executed a supplementary treaty in view of approaching hostilities between the Indian government and the shah of Persia. Shortly after came the great revolt in Upper India, and Edwardes's foresight in helping to make a friend of Dost Muhamad was abundantly justified; all through the revolt of the sepoy army the Afghans remained silent, and even

sympathetic, spectators of their neighbours' trouble. On the receipt of the telegram announcing the events of 10 and 11 May at Meerut and Delhi, Edwardes wrote to Sir J. Lawrence, who at first delayed acquiescence in the projects of his more ardent subordinate. But the chief coming as far as Pindi to confer with Edwardes was so far influenced by the arguments laid before him as to give sanction to the levy of a mixed force, and to the formation of a movable column which subsequently maintained order in the Punjab and ultimately aided powerfully in the overthrow of the mutineers in the south of the Sutlej.

Before long a difference arose between these two great public servants, which has been somewhat unduly magnified by some of Edwardes's admirers. Edwardes was, naturally enough, anxious to do all in his power to hold the dangerous post which had been assigned to him by the government of India; Lawrence had to think not only of that, but of the whole Punjab provinces, and even, for a time, of the empire at large. Therefore when Edwardes pressed for reinforcements and asked that some of the troops destined to take part in the siege of Delhi should be diverted for the defence of Peshawur, Lawrence had to answer that Delhi was a big thing, and that there was a possibility that Peshawur might have to be sacrificed to Delhi and to the necessity of concentrating on the hither side of the Indus. The Peshawur authorities were much excited at this suggestion, and referred to Lord Canning at Calcutta, by whom, but not until August, it was decided that Peshawur should be held 'to the last.' It is surely unnecessary that a statesman like Lawrence should be depreciated in order that the very genuine and true services of his able agent should be duly valued. The latest historian sums up the controversy in these words: 'Had things come to the worst elsewhere, it is obvious that such a move would have saved . . . the Punjab from untold disasters' (Trotter, i. 486).

After a bold and entirely prosperous administration of his charge Edwardes began to feel the consequences of the long trial, and in September 1858 wrote that he was 'quite tired of work.' But he was not able to leave his post for another twelvemonth, and when he did it is to be feared that his health had received permanent injury. In the middle of 1859 he once more came to England, and in the following year was urged to stand as a candidate for the representation of Glasgow in the House of Commons. He declined the invitation, deciding that he would remain in the Indian service. The next two years were passed in England, where Edwardes delivered several addresses on Indian affairs, and received the honour of knighthood, with a step in the order of the Bath. He was also made LL.D. by the university of Cambridge. His health now showed signs of amendment, and in the beginning of 1862 he was back in the Punjab, filling the honourable place of commissioner of Umballa. This is a coveted appointment, involving the privilege of working in mountain air during the summer, and Edwardes's life for the next three years was singularly happy. On 1 Jan. 1865 Edwardes was driven to Europe by a failure both of his wife's health and of his own strength. He left India for ever, regretted by Lawrence, as 'a born ruler of men.'

The short remnant of his days was chiefly spent in London, where Edwardes devoted himself to the cause of public and private benevolence. He was a vice-president of the Church Missionary Society and a supporter of the City Mission, and he took charge of Lawrence's family while his old chief was labouring in India as viceroy. Any spare time was to be devoted to the biography of the viceroy's brother, Sir Henry, a work which Edwardes never lived to complete. He was now promoted major-general and made a commander of the order of the Star of India, receiving further a 'good-conduct pension' of 100*l.* a year. He threw himself into evangelical movements with characteristic ardour, and his personal charm and fluent language made him a welcome speaker on the platforms of that party. He took a particularly active part in the opposition to ritualism in the Anglican church which marked the period.

In March 1868 came a bad attack of pleurisy. While still convalescent Edwardes was offered the reversion of the lieutenant-governorship of the Punjab. But the expected vacancy did not occur, and Edwardes's health relapsed. On 5 Nov. he came back from Scotland, where he had experienced a short return of strength, and he died in London on 23 Dec. 1868. His memory was honoured by a mural tablet in Westminster Abbey, erected by the secretary of state in council. His fellow-students and private friends, by a stained window in King's College chapel, attested their loving admiration, and he was likewise commemorated in his first district, Bunnoo, where the capital town is now known, according to Punjab fashion, as 'Edwardesábád.'

The great characteristic of Edwardes is the combination of bright intelligence with strong prejudices. These, if they sometimes warped his judgment, always inspired and sustained his conduct. His most energetic state paper was attended by no success. After the sup-

pression of the revolt of 1857 he urged upon the government the duty of publicly supporting the propagation of the gospel in India by projects which were generally condemned at the time, and which are now all but forgotten. This part of Edwardes's public life has been thus summed up by a generally sympathetic writer: 'In his scheme for governing India on christian principles and his subsequent addresses to London audiences the brilliant commissioner of Peshawur betrayed a curious lack of sound statesmanship, an unchristian contempt for that form of justice which aims at treating others as we would be treated ourselves. In this respect he differed widely from John Lawrence, whose fervent piety was largely tempered by his stern love of justice and his sturdy common sense' (Trotter, *India under Victoria*, 1886).

The epithet of the historian is well chosen. Edwardes was brilliant rather than large-minded. Gay, buoyant, self-relying, he carried the minds of other men with him on most occasions of his life. But his work had something temporary about it. He established few doctrines, and founded no school. On the general frontier question, indeed, his knowledge and experience saved him from rash counsels. But even here his policy was not new, having been founded by Elphinstone and affirmed by later statesmen. Where Edwardes was more of an originator he was less of a success; his extreme zeal for mission work in Afghanistan, for instance, can hardly be said to have been endorsed by events.

It is as a man of action that he deserves unstinted praise. He had a natural military genius, independent of professional training, and a strength of will and talent for administration, which stood in no need of technical instruction. If he was thrown into the world before he had completed his education, he was compensated by being surrounded at an early age by highly formative conditions. Under these he developed his great qualities, and finished his training in the wide school of experience. If untouched by the spirit of the age in Europe, he was all the more qualified for the mastery of Asiatics. With his success and his shortcomings, in his acquirements no less than in his limitations, he is a typical figure in a class to whom the nation owes a debt of gratitude. With the dashing spirit of the cavalier the early Punjab officer united something of the earnestness of the Ironside, but the very qualities which aided them in their rapid rise perhaps hindered them in after life. They were, for the most part, content to see other men build on their foundations.

[The best materials for the study of Edwardes's life and character are furnished by his widow—Memorials of the Life and Letters of Major-general Sir H. Edwardes, K.C.B., &c., London, 1886. For the general history of the time the works cited above may be consulted; also the Histories of the Sepoy Mutiny of Malleson, Kaye, and Holmes; with Mr. Bosworth Smith's Life of John Lawrence and Edwardes and Merivale's Life of Henry Lawrence.] H. G. K.

EDWARDS, ARTHUR (*d.* 1743), major, for many years the archæological ally of Dr. Stukeley and Lord Winchilsea (Nichols, *Lit. Anecd.* xi. 772), was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries on 17 Nov. 1725 ([Gough], *List of Members of Soc. Antiq.* 4to, 1798, p. *4). He died first major of the second troop of horse guards in Grosvenor Street, London, 22 June 1743 (*Gent. Mag.* xiii. 389; affidavit appended to will). His will of 11 June 1738 was proved at London 13 July 1743, a second grant being made 7 Nov. 1745 (registered in P. C. C., 230, Boycott). Therein he refers to his family merely as 'my brothers and sisters, the children of my father.' The fire of 23 Oct. 1731, by which the Cotton Library was so seriously injured, induced Edwards to make the munificent gift of 7,000*l.* to the trustees 'to erect and build such a house as may be most likely to preserve that library as much as can be from all accidents.' Owing, however, to the protraction of a life interest in the legacy, it did not become available until other arrangements had made its application to building purposes needless (Edwards, *Memoirs of Libraries*, i. 434, 460). It was consequently, in pursuance of the testator's contingent instructions, appropriated to the purchase of 'such manuscripts, books of antiquities, ancient coins, medals, and other curiosities as might be worthy to increase and inlarge the said Cotton Library.' Edwards also bequeathed about two thousand volumes of printed books and their cases; also, his 'pictures of King George the 1st, the Czar Peter, Oliver Cromwell, and Cosimo di Medicis the 1st, with his secretary, Bartolomeo Concini . . . to be placed in the aforesaid library.'

[Authorities as above.] G. G.

EDWARDS, BRYAN (1743–1800), West India merchant, was born at Westbury, Wiltshire, on 21 May 1743. His father inherited a small estate, valued at about 100*l.* a year, and to support his large family endeavoured to add to his income by dealings in corn and malt. This attempt did not prove successful, and at his death in 1756 his wife and six children were left in poverty. Fortunately for his children's sake the widow had two rich brothers in the West Indies, and one of them, Zachary Bayly of Jamaica, took

the family under his protection. Edwards had been placed at the school of William Foot, a dissenting minister of Bristol, and a good instructor, though forbidden to teach his pupil Latin and Greek; but after his father's death the boy was removed to a French boarding-school in the same city, where he learnt the French language, and, having access to a circulating library, acquired a passion for books. In 1759 his younger uncle returned to England, and took his nephew to live with him in London. The pair quickly disagreed, and after an experience of a few months Bryan was shipped off to Jamaica to his other uncle, a man of kinder disposition and more enlightened mind, who engaged for the nephew's sake a clergyman to dwell in the family, from whom he learnt 'small Latin and less Greek,' but from whose instruction and example he gained a taste for composition. The nephew was admitted to a share, and after a few years succeeded to the entirety of his uncle's business, and is also said to have been left in 1773 heir to the great property of a Mr. Hume of Jamaica. Through Edwards's fostering care the business continued to prosper, and his talents secured for him a leading position in the colonial assembly, 'where he attacked the restrictions placed by the government on trade with the United States.' He returned to his native country for a time, and in 1782 contested the representation of Chichester in the independent interest against the Duke of Richmond's nominee. At the poll he was defeated by eight votes (239 to 247), and although he attempted to gain the seat by a petition in the commons and by an action in the court of king's bench, he abstained from prosecuting the petition to an issue, and lost his action. In the beginning of 1787 he repaired again to the West Indies, and dwelt there until the autumn of 1792, when he settled permanently in England as a West India merchant, and established a bank at Southampton. In 1794 he contested its representation with the son of its patron, and after a severe contest was rejected by the electors; but at the general election in 1796 he was elected, through the influence of the Eliots, as member for the Cornish borough of Grampound. By Mr. Speaker Abbot the new member was described as 'a heavy-looking man,' using language 'very awkward and inelegant;' but Wilberforce, with more candour, acknowledged that he found in Edwards, who supported the slave trade with certain restrictions, 'a powerful opponent of slave trade abolition.' He had long suffered from ill-health, and did not live through this parliament, but died at his house at the Polygon, Southampton, on 15 or 16 July 1800, and was buried in a vault under the church of All Saints, Southampton. He married Maria, younger daughter of Thomas Phipps of Brook House, Westbury, and left an only son, Hume Edwards, to inherit his vast wealth.

The chief work of Edwards was 'The History of the British Colonies in the West Indies.' Two volumes of this work, containing much information on the slave trade, were published in 1793, and in the same year an impression was issued at Dublin. The second edition appeared in 1794, when the owners of the first issue were enabled by a separate publication, entitled 'List of Maps and Plates for the History of the British Colonies in the West Indies,' to complete their copies by the purchase of the maps, plates, &c. which were contained in the improved edition. Not long after he had compiled this work he conceived the idea of writing a general account of all the settlements in the West Indies, but with especial attention to the French colonies. He visited St. Domingo shortly after the revolt of the negroes in 1791, and, although disappointed in his comprehensive scheme, published in 1797 'An Historical Survey of the French Colony in the Island of St. Domingo,' which was reproduced in 1807, 'together with an account of the Maroon Negroes in Jamaica, and a History of the War in the West Indies, by Bryan Edwards. Also a tour through Barbadoes, St. Vincent, &c., by Sir William Young, bart.' This volume, which was left unfinished through the author's death, and to which was prefixed 'A Sketch of the Life of the Author, written by himself a short time before his death,' was also issued as a third volume to the original 'History of the British Colonies,' and the whole work was at the same time reissued in three volumes with the date of 1801. The fifth edition was passed through the press in 1819. The complete work was translated into German, some parts were rendered into Spanish, and the history of St. Domingo was translated into French. Though the history was generally popular, and was highly praised by such competent critics as McCulloch, the opinions of the author did not meet with universal acceptance. The history of St. Domingo condemned the treatment which its negroes received from the settlers, and reflected severely on the conduct of its French inhabitants towards the English who came there after 1791, and for his views on these matters Edwards was attacked in a voluminous letter addressed to him in 1797 in both French and English by Colonel Venault de Charmilly. The modified continuance of slavery which Edwards advocated in these

volumes provoked in 1795 a letter of remonstrance from William Preston of Dublin. Edwards succeeded Sir Joseph Banks in 1797 as the secretary 'of the Association for Promoting the Discovery of the Interior Parts of Africa,' and the second volume of the society's 'Proceedings' contained 'an abstract of Mr. Park's account of his travels and discoveries, abridged from his own minutes by Bryan Edwards,' some copies of which were struck off separately for the private use of the members in 1798. The whole of the narrative of Edwards was incorporated in the large volume of 'Travels in the Interior Districts of Africa, performed . . . in 1795 and 1796 by Mungo Park' (1799), and it has even been asserted by some critics that Park was indebted to Edwards for the composition of that volume. Dr. Thomas Somerville was so informed by Bishop Majendie, who claimed to make the statement on trustworthy evidence, 'being not only a member of the African society, but having often been a witness of Mr. Park's putting his notes into the hands of Edwards, who afterwards arranged and transfused them into a collected and expanded narrative.' The abilities of Park were equal to its composition, and the probable conclusion is that although he sought the advice, and paid deference to the views of Edwards, the recital of his travels was in the main his own narrative.

Edwards was also the author of several smaller works. 1. 'Thoughts on the late Proceedings of Government respecting the Trade of the West India Islands with the United States,' 1784, in which he argued in favour of free intercourse in trade, and condemned the American war. This pamphlet brought him into controversy with Lord Sheffield, and provoked an address to him from a writer called John Stevenson. 2. 'Speech at a free Conference between the Council and Assembly of Jamaica on Mr. Wilberforce's Propositions concerning the Slave Trade,' 1790. 3. 'Poems,' printed and privately distributed among his friends about 1794. 4. 'Vindication of the Proceedings of the English Government towards the Spanish Nation in 1655,' in reference to Jamaica, which forms pp. xxix–xxxviii of 'Preface and Historical Documents to be prefixed to the new edition of the Jamaica Laws.' 5. 'Proceedings of the Governor and Assembly of Jamaica in regard to the Maroon Negroes. To which is prefixed an introductory account [by Edwards] on the disposition of the Maroons, and of the late War between these People and the White Inhabitants.' Edwards is said by more than one authority to have driven Dr. Wolcot, generally known as 'Peter Pindar,' from Jamaica, through the vigour of his satire; but Polwhele, who knew Wolcot's history well, asserts that the doctor came to England for ordination and admission to a good benefice in Jamaica. A portrait of Edwards was painted by Abbot and engraved by Holloway.

[Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biog.; Censura Literaria, vi. 222; Somerville's Life and Times, pp. 323–4; Gent. Mag. 1800, pp. 702, 793–4; W. D. Cooper's Parliamentary History of Sussex, p. 15; Life of Wilberforce, ii. 196, 241, 277; Davies's Southampton, p. 398; Oldfield's Representative History, iii. 551; Hoare's History of Wiltshire, vol. iii. pt. i. pp. 32, 41; Life of Mungo Park in Journals of his Mission to Africa in 1805, pp. xvi, xx–xxxi, cix–cxi, and addenda, pp. xx–xxv; Notes and Queries (1868), 4th ser. i. 56, 139.] W. P. C.

EDWARDS, CHARLES (*d.* 1691?), Welsh author, was entered in 1644 as a student of All Souls' College, Oxford, at the age of sixteen, his father being described as a plebeian. It is supposed that his father was Robert Edwards of Cynlleth, that he was born at Rhyd-y-Croesau in Denbighshire, and that he received his early education either at Ruthin or Oswestry. It is almost certain he never received episcopal ordination. In 1648 Edwards replied to the parliamentary visitors at Oxford, 'I humbly submit to this visitation as far as its proceedings be according to the laws of the land and the statutes of this university,' and this answer was not deemed satisfactory. On 14 June he was expelled, but through the kind offices of some friends he was elected to a scholarship at Jesus College 27 Oct. 1648. On 30 Oct., when the old fellows and scholars were expelled, Edwards was allowed to remain. In June 1649 he was appointed to make a Latin declamation in praise of clemency, and his freedom of speech appears to have given great umbrage. He says: 'Whether my discourse of clemency procured me severity I cannot tell, but sure I am that soon after it was used towards me.' Yet he was afterwards made an honorary fellow. In the same year he was awarded the place and emolument of Bible reader. In the same year he took his bachelor's degree. He seems to have lingered at the university, hoping, perhaps, that his friends would be able to obtain him an appointment at some other college. Failing this, he settled in Denbighshire and married. In 1653 the 'sine cura' of Llanrhaiadr was conferred on him. This had been vacant since the death of Dr. John Owen, bishop of St. Asaph, 16 Oct. 1651. He preached as an itinerant, catechised the children on Sundays, and held monthly fasts on a week day in public and private. On the accession of Charles II

his troubles were greatly increased, and the benefice was soon taken out of his hands. In 1666 soldiers broke into his house at night, went into his cellar, got drunk on his beer, called him a traitor, and with great violence took him prisoner and carried him to the county gaol. His release cost him time and money, and on his return home he seems to have found one of his children dead from fright. 'Within a few months afterwards,' says he, 'my wife and some of my surviving children, being discouraged in their obedience by the many injuries they saw inflicted on me, became undutiful. . . .' His children were persuaded that it was better for them to be without him, and his wife was so far alienated from him that she importuned him to part from her and live asunder, though for sixteen years they had lived together as lovingly as any couple in the country. They separated by mutual consent, and he returned to Oxford in 1666. Henceforward he devoted himself mainly to Welsh literature, and the next few years were employed on the book by which he is best known, 'Hanes y Ffydd Ddiffuant,' which is a kind of history of christianity, interspersed with much interesting information respecting the tenets of the ancient Welsh bards. He maintains their orthodoxy, and shows that the primitive British church was independent of that of Rome. The book was published at Oxford in 1671, with a Latin recommendation from the pen of Dr. Michael Roberts, the principal of Jesus College at the date of Edwards's expulsion. In 1675 he was in London busy with the printing of some Welsh books. In this year he published his curious little work, of which several editions have appeared, 'Hebraicorum Cambro-Britannicorum Specimen.' It is intended to show the Hebrew origin of the Welsh language. The second edition of 'Hanes y Ffydd' appeared in Oxford in 1676, the third in 1677, the fourth at Shrewsbury in 1722, fifth and sixth at Dolgelley in 1811 and 1812, seventh at Carmarthen in 1856. His 'Plain Pathway' appeared in 1682, 'Book of the Resolution' in 1684, and in 1686 'Fatherly Instructions' and 'Gildas Minimus.' About this time he probably eked out a precarious living as a bookseller, for in 'Fatherly Instructions' he says that 'British books are to be had with the publisher hereof.' His last known work is his autobiography (1691), bearing the title 'An Afflicted Man's Testimony concerning his Troubles.' It is probable that he died soon after this.

Notwithstanding the great amount of additional information discovered and recently made public in the paper read by Mr. Ivor James of Cardiff, at a meeting of the Cymmrodorion Society, 26 March 1886, still, as Mr. James adds, 'a mystery remains—how came this man, the object of so much malevolence, to be the mouthpiece of a body of gentlemen, who comprised among their number Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Baxter, Stephen Hughes, and Jones of Llangynwyd. Had he friends? They stood aloof from him; his relatives, his wife, his children, kindred and acquaintances, all leagued, according to his story, against his character, estate, and life.'

[Ivor James's Paper; Williams's Eminent Welshmen; Foulkes's Geirlyfr Bywgraffiadol.]

R. J. J.

EDWARDS, EDWARD (1738–1806), painter, the elder son of a chairmaker and carver, who had come from Shrewsbury, and settled in London, was born in London 7 March 1738. He was a weakly child, with distorted limbs, and remained of very small size all his life. At an early age he went to a French protestant school, but at fifteen was removed in order to work at his father's business. He worked up to eighteen with a Mr. Hallet, an upholsterer at the corner of St. Martin's Lane and Long Acre, drawing patterns for furniture. His father then sent him to a drawing school, and in 1759 he was admitted as a student into the Duke of Richmond's gallery. He lost his father in 1760, when the support of his mother and sister devolved upon him. Edwards took lodgings in Compton Street, Soho, and opened an evening school for drawing. In 1761 he was admitted a student in the academy in St. Martin's Lane, where he studied from the life. In 1763 he was employed by John Boydell [q. v.] to make drawings for engravers, and in the following year succeeded in gaining a premium from the Society of Arts for the best historical picture in chiaroscuro, which he exhibited at the Free Society of Artists in the same year, the subject being 'The Death of Tatius.' He subsequently exhibited with the Incorporated Society of Artists, of which body he became a member, quitting it, however, for the Royal Academy, where he exhibited for the first time in 1771, sending 'The Angel appearing to Hagar and Ishmael,' and a portrait. He continued to exhibit there up to the year of his death, contributing pictures of various descriptions, and numerous portraits. Among them may be noted 'Bacchus and Ariadne' (1773), 'Oliver protected by Orlando, from "As you like it"' (1775), 'View of Brancepeth Castle, near Durham' (1784), 'A View of the River at Barn Elms' (1785), 'The Angel appearing to Gideon' (1792), 'The Release of the Prisoners from Dorchester Gaol' (1796), 'Portrait of Rev. H. Whit-

field, D.D.' (1799), 'Cupid and Psyche' (1800), &c. In 1773 he was elected an associate of the Royal Academy. He was employed by the Society of Antiquaries to make a drawing from the picture in the royal collection of 'The Interview between Henry VIII and Francis I at Calais;' for this drawing, which occupied him six months, he received 110 guineas. He was also employed by Lord Bessborough to repair a ceiling painted by Sir James Thornhill at Roehampton, by Mr. Bell on designs for his Shakespeare and other publications, and by Mr. Robert Udny. Owing to the kind assistance of the last-named he was enabled to visit Italy, and left for Rome in July 1775, returning in September 1776. In 1781 he obtained a premium for landscape, and in this year he presented a paper to the Royal Society on the damage wrought by the great storm at Roehampton. In 1782 he painted three ceilings for the Hon. Charles Hamilton at Bath. About this time too he was employed a great deal by Horace Walpole at Strawberry Hill, for whom he made many drawings; in 1784, however, some disagreement led to a breach between them. In 1786 he painted for Mr. Estcourt a 'Hunting Party,' containing portraits of the Duke of Beaufort and his sons; in the following year he was painting scenes for the theatre at Newcastle-on-Tyne. In 1788 he was appointed professor of perspective at the Royal Academy, and subsequently published a treatise on that subject. He was occupied for some time on a picture representing 'The Interior View of Westminster Abbey on the Commemoration of Handel.' This he completed and exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1793. In 1799 he was induced by Boydell to paint a scene from 'The Two Gentlemen of Verona' for the Shakespeare Gallery. He lost his mother in 1800, but continued to support his sister until his death (19 Dec. 1806). He was buried in St. Pancras churchyard. Edwards was a proficient in etching, and in 1792 published a set of fifty-two etchings. There is a volume in the print room of the British Museum containing others, and also some of his unsuccessful essays in that art. He designed numerous illustrations, wrote verses, and played the violin. He compiled and published a volume entitled 'Anecdotes of Painters' (1808), intended as a supplement to Walpole's work; though rather loosely put together, it contains valuable records of contemporary artists which might otherwise have perished. A portrait engraved by Cardon after his own drawing is prefixed to the work; the original drawing, with two others by Edwards, is in the print room at the British Museum.

[Memoir prefixed to the Anecdotes of Painters; Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Sandby's Hist. of the Royal Academy; Notes in Anderdon's illustrated copy of the Anecdotes, print room Brit. Mus.; Catalogues of the Royal Academy, &c.] L. C.

EDWARDS, EDWARD (1803–1879), marine zoologist, was born on 23 Nov. 1803, at Corwen, Merionethshire, where he received his education. He started in life as a draper at Bangor, Carnarvonshire, which business he carried on until 1839, when he retired from it. In the following year he established a foundry and ironworks at Menai Bridge, which he appears to have carried on for several years with much success. In 1864, being interested in observing the forms of marine life in the beautiful waters of the Menai Straits, he began to study the habits and characters of the fish in their native element. He was induced to attempt an artificial arrangement for preserving the fish in health in confinement, so as to be enabled to study their habits more closely. By an imitation of the natural conditions under which the fishes flourished, he succeeded in introducing such improvements in the construction of aquaria as enabled him to preserve the fish for an almost unlimited period without change of water. His most notable improvement was his 'dark-water chamber slope-back tank,' the result of a close study of the rock-pools, with their fissures and chasms, in the rocks on the shores of the Menai Straits. This improvement retarded for a long time the falling off in the taste for domestic aquaria, and the principle of Edwards's tank was most successfully adopted in all the large establishments of this country, and in many of the continental and American zoological schools. To the pursuit of this interesting branch of natural history Edwards devoted the last years of his life, dying, at the age of seventy-five, on 13 Aug. 1879, after an attack of paralysis.

[Athenæum, No. 2706, 6 Sept. 1879; information from friends in Anglesea, and from Edwards's son, Mr. John R. Edwards of Liverpool.] R. H–r.

EDWARDS, EDWARD (1812–1886), librarian, was born in 1812, probably in London. Of his education and early employments we have no account, but in 1836 he appears as a pamphleteer on subjects of public interest, and his productions evince considerable information as well as mental activity and intelligence. He wrote on national universities, with especial reference to the university of London, whose charter was then under discussion; on the British Museum, at

the time undergoing thorough investigation from Mr. Hawes's committee; and, at a somewhat later date, on the reform of the Royal Academy. His attention was probably directed to the latter subject by the work he undertook in 1837, in connection with the patentees of the Collas system of engraving, on the great seals of England, and on the medals struck under the French Empire. His account of the latter extends from 1804 to 1810, but was never completed. He also about this time assisted Mr. W. Macarthur in his account of New South Wales, though his name did not appear in connection with the work. Meanwhile his pamphlet on the museum and the evidence he had given before the museum committee had attracted the attention of the authorities, and in 1839 he became a supernumerary assistant in the printed book department, for especial employment on the new catalogue ordered by the trustees. Edwards was one of the four coadjutors of Panizzi in framing the ninety-one rules for the formation of this catalogue, the others being John Winter Jones, afterwards principal librarian; Thomas Watts, afterwards keeper of printed books; and Serjeant Parry, then, like Edwards, a supernumerary assistant. On the commencement of the catalogue Edwards was assigned to the duty of cataloguing the collection of civil war tracts, formed under Charles I and the Commonwealth by the bookseller Thomason, and containing more than thirty thousand separate pieces. These were entirely catalogued by him, and his titles are generally very good and full, sometimes perhaps almost superfluously minute. The task seems to have absorbed his energies for several years, or any other literary work which he may have produced was anonymous. About 1846 he began to devote great attention to the statistics of libraries, collected returns supplied by foreign librarians or excerpted by himself from foreign publications, and published the results in the 'Athenæum.' Unfortunately these statistics were frequently fallacious, and Mr. Watts, in a series of letters published in the 'Athenæum' under the signature 'Verificator,' easily showed that Edwards's assertions and conclusions were little to be relied on. They had served, however, to make him a popular authority, and he was able to render very valuable service to William Ewart [q. v.], whose committee on free libraries in 1850 originated free library legislation in this country. It was natural that Edwards should be offered the librarianship of the first important free library established under Mr. Ewart's act, which he was the more disposed to accept as his engagement at the museum had from various causes ceased to be satisfactory to himself or the authorities. He accordingly became in 1850 the first librarian of the Manchester Free Library (opened 1852), and applied himself with much energy to the management and development of the institution. His project for a classified catalogue was published in 1855 in the form of a letter to Sir John Potter, chairman of the library committee. The relations of the librarian of a free library and his committee frequently require tact and forbearance on both sides, and this was certainly wanting on the part of Edwards, whose temper was naturally impatient of control, and who admits in the pamphlet already mentioned that he had been taxed both with indifference to economy and with an undue regard to his own reputation. His position grew more and more uneasy, and in 1858 he was compelled to resign. The rest of his life was devoted to the literary labours which will chiefly contribute to preserve his name. In 1859 appeared his 'Memoirs of Libraries,' a work of great value, containing a general history of libraries from the earliest ages, continued and supplemented by his 'Libraries and their Founders,' 1865. By his 'Lives of the Founders of the British Museum' (1870) he made himself the historian of the national library, and although his work must be supplemented and may possibly be superseded by others, it is likely to remain the groundwork of every future history. It is in general accurate as well as painstaking, and evinces an impartiality creditable to the writer when the circumstances of his retirement from the museum are considered. Previous to the appearance of this important work he had written the article 'Libraries' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' published (1869) a small book on 'Free Town Libraries;' written his 'Chapters on the Biographical History of the French Academy' (1864); edited the 'Liber Monasterii de Hyda' for the Rolls Series; and produced (1865) his biography of Sir Walter Raleigh. The second volume is particularly valuable, containing for the first time a complete edition of Raleigh's correspondence; the memoir also has considerable merit, but it appeared almost simultaneously with St. John's; and it was remarked with surprise that each biography appeared to be deficient in whatever gave interest to the other, and that the two would need to be blended to produce a really satisfactory work. After the publication of his history of the museum, Edwards accepted an engagement to catalogue the library of Queen's College, Oxford, which occupied him for several years. On the formation of the Library Association in 1877

he was proposed as its first president, but the deafness from which he was by this time suffering would alone have been an insuperable obstacle to his discharge of the office. After the completion of his Oxford engagement he retired to Niton in the Isle of Wight, and occupied himself with projects for a recast of his 'Memoirs of Libraries,' with great alterations and improvements. A prospectus of the intended work was issued by Trübner & Co. Edwards negotiated for the appearance of a portion of it in the 'Library Chronicle,' and was understood to have collected considerable material for it, but it does not seem to be known whether this still exists. His last published book was a 'Handbook to Lists of Collective Biography,' undertaken in conjunction with Mr. C. Hole, the first and only part of which appeared in 1885. He also wrote the greater part of the article 'Newspapers' in the ninth edition of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' He died at Niton, 10 Feb. 1886. Notwithstanding serious faults and frequent failures, Edwards's name will always be associated with the history of librarianship in England. His services in connection with the free library movement were very valuable; and he did much to awaken attention to the defects of English libraries and librarianship. As a literary historian he was erudite and industrious, though not sufficiently discriminating. His works occupy a place of their own, and will always remain valuable mines of information. His opinions on library matters, whether expressed in his evidence before the museums committee or in his own writings, are almost always sensible and sound. They exhibit few traces of that vehemence of temperament and that incapacity for harmonious co-operation with others which were at the root of most of his failures, and placed him in a false position for so great a part of his life.

[Autobiographical passages in Edwards's writings; Memoirs in Academy and Library Chronicle; Reports of British Museum committees, 1835 and 1849; personal knowledge.]

R. G.

EDWARDS, EDWIN (1823–1879), painter and etcher, born at Framlingham, Suffolk, on 6 Jan. 1823, a son of Mr. Charles Edwards of Bridgham Hall, Norfolk, was educated at Dedham, Essex, under Dr. Taylor. Early in life he studied law, and gave up a large and successful practice as an examining proctor in the admiralty and prerogative courts in order to follow his tastes as an artist. As a lawyer he wrote an 'Abridgment of Cases in the Prerogative Court;' 'A Treatise on the Jurisdiction of the High Court of Admiralty;' and 'Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, a Sketch,' 1833. From 1860 Edwards devoted all his time and energy to art. First he painted in water-colours. In 1861 he made the acquaintance of Fantin Latour, Jacquemart, and other well-known French artists, and commenced painting in oil. His pictures of the Cornish coast scenery attracted considerable attention at the Royal Academy exhibition in Trafalgar Square, and his 'Gainsborough Lane' was much admired in 1877. As an etcher his works are numerous, about 371, consisting of scenes of the Thames at Sunbury, English cathedral cities, wild Cornish coast, scenes in Suffolk, &c. He also published a work upon 'Old Inns of England,' profusely illustrated with etchings. He married Elizabeth Ruth, and died on 15 Sept. 1879. An exhibition of Edwards's paintings, water-colours, and etchings was held at the Continental Galleries, 168 New Bond Street, soon after his death.

[Journal des Beaux-Arts illustré, October 1879; Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1 Nov. 1879; La Vie Moderne, 4 Oct. 1879; L'Art, 23 Nov. 1879.]

L. F.

EDWARDS, GEORGE (1694–1773), naturalist, born at Stratford, Essex, 3 April 1694, was taught in early years by a clergyman named Hewit, who kept a public school at Leytonstone, and afterwards served an apprenticeship in Fenchurch Street, London. As a youth he had an opportunity of examining the library of Dr. Nicholas, and read incessantly. At the expiration of his apprenticeship he spent a month in Holland; in 1718 went to Norway, and was captured at Friedrichstadt by Danish soldiers, who suspected him of being a spy. He journeyed through France in 1719 and 1720, partly on foot. On returning home he began to make coloured drawings of animals, which fetched good prices. James Theobald, F.R.S., proved a zealous patron; and after an excursion in Holland, in 1731, Edwards was appointed (December 1733), on Sir Hans Sloane's recommendation, librarian of the Royal College of Physicians. The publication of his 'History of Birds' began in 1743, and occupied him till 1764. On St. Andrew's day 1750 Edwards was presented with the gold medal of the Royal Society, of which he was afterwards elected a fellow. He became a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries 13 Feb. 1752. About 1764 Edwards retired to Plaistow, and died of cancer and stone 23 July 1773. He was buried in West Ham churchyard. A portrait by Dandridge was engraved by J. S. Millar in 1754. His chief work, 'The History of Birds,' was dedicated to God. The first volume appeared in 1743, the second in 1747, the third in 1750, and

the fourth in 1751. Under the new title of 'Gleanings of Natural History' three additional volumes were issued in 1758, 1760, and 1764 respectively. Nearly six hundred subjects in natural history not before delineated are here engraved. A generical index in French and English was added. Linnæus often corresponded with Edwards, and prepared an additional index of the Linnæan names. Edwards's collection of drawings was purchased by the Marquis of Bute shortly before the naturalist's death. Edwards's papers in the 'Philosophical Transactions' were collected by J. Robson, and issued with the Linnæan index in 1776. Edwards was also the author of 'Essays of Natural History' (1770) and 'Elements of Fossilogy' (1776).

[Biog. Brit. (Kippis); Nichols's Lit. Anecd. v. 317–26; Watt's Bibl. Brit.]

EDWARDS, GEORGE, M.D. (1752–1823), took his degree at Edinburgh University in 1772, and appears to have practised as a physician in London, and latterly at Barnard Castle, Durham. He was an untiring propounder of political and social schemes between 1779 and 1819. The British Museum contains forty-two of his books; the following titles are sufficiently significant: 'A certain Way to save our Country, and make us a more happy and flourishing people than at any former period of our history' (1807); 'The Practical System of Human Economy, or the New Era at length fully ascertained, whereby we are able in one immediate simple undertaking to remove the distress, burdens, and grievances of the times, and to bring all our interests, public, private, and commercial, to their intended perfection' (1816). Edwards's writings abound in the unconscious humour of the egotist deeply persuaded of his mission. He gives notice that 'the Almighty has destined that I should discover his true system of human economy.' In a petition to the House of Commons (1816?) he prays that the house should carry out the schemes which were the fruits of 'almost half a century's attention.' Among his proposals were the removal of taxes hurtful to industry, economy and reduction of public expenditure, the sale of certain national properties, particularly Gibraltar, the extension of the income tax to all orders, and forbearance for any requisite period to pay off the national debt as 'altogether superfluous with the accession of the new and happy era of mankind.' Government boards were to superintend all the interests of mankind, and everybody was to be actuated by truly christian principles. He published an address 'aux citoyens Français sur la Nouvelle Constitution,' and 'Idées pour former une Nouvelle Constitution, et pour assurer la prospérité et le bonheur de la France et d'autres nations' (Paris, 1793). It does not appear that Edwards attracted any attention, and it may be conjectured that his sanity was imperfect. He died in London on 17 Feb. 1823, in his seventy-second year.

[Gent. Mag. (1823), p. 569; Brit. Mus. Cat.]
J. M. S.

EDWARDS, GEORGE NELSON, M.D. (1830–1868), physician, son of a surgeon, was born at Eye, Suffolk, in 1830, and received his school education in part at the grammar school of Yarmouth, and in part at that of Beccles. He obtained one of the studentships in medicine endowed by Tancred, a Yorkshire squire, at Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, where he graduated M.B. in 1851, and after studying at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, London, obtained the license in medicine then given by the university of Cambridge in 1854, and became M.D. in 1859. He was elected assistant-physician to St. Bartholomew's Hospital in 1860, was secretary to the medical council of the hospital from 14 Jan. 1865 to 9 Feb. 1867, and was in 1866 elected lecturer on forensic medicine in the medical school. He also held the office of medical registrar, and was elected physician to the hospital 23 Jan. 1867, but did not long enjoy that office. One day, while going round the wards, he fell down in a uræmic convulsion, was removed to his own house, and went through many of the most distressing accompaniments of chronic Bright's disease. He grew blind so gradually that he did not know when he had totally ceased to see. A physician who had been at Caius College with him used constantly to visit him, and one day found him sitting before a window through which a bright sun was shining on his face. 'Please draw up the blind,' said Edwards, unconscious that the atrophy of his optic discs was complete. He was a small man, who had been bullied at school, teased at Cambridge, and envied at St. Bartholomew's for the success which was the reward of perseverance rather than of ability. He attained considerable practice, and seemed sure of a long tenure of it when his fatal illness began. He bore it heroically, and never complained but once, and then not of his sufferings, but of a remark which made him think a candidate for his office was too anxious to succeed him. He died 6 Dec. 1868. He edited the first three volumes of the 'St. Bartholomew's Hospital Reports,' 1865–7, and published in 1862

'The Examination of the Chest in a Series of Tables.' He described (*St. Bartholomew's Hospital Reports*, i. 141) two cases of poisoning by mercuric methide, the symptoms of which were then new to medicine, and also wrote a paper 'On the Value of Palpation in the Diagnosis of Tubercular Disease of the Lungs' (*ib.* ii. 216).

[Memoir by G. W. Callender in St. Bartholomew's Hospital Reports, vol. v.; MS. Minutes of Medical Council and Journals of St. Bartholomew's Hospital; information from Dr. F. Harris.] N. M.

EDWARDS, HENRY THOMAS (1837–1884), dean of Bangor, son of the Rev. William Edwards, vicar of Llangollen, who died in 1868, was born at Llanymawddwy, Merionethshire, 6 Sept. 1837, and educated at Westminster, where he was a Welsh 'Bishop's Boy' holding the Williams exhibition. He left Westminster in his seventeenth year with the intention of proceeding to India, but, changing his mind, studied for twelve months under the Rev. F. E. Gretton at Stamford, and then entered himself at Jesus College, Oxford. He graduated B.A. in 1860, and in the following year became curate at Llangollen to his father, who being an invalid left almost sole charge of the parish to his son. He restored the church at an expense of 3,000*l.*, and the number of the Welsh congregation was nearly trebled during the time of his ministration. In 1866 he was appointed to the vicarage of Aberdare, where, during his residence of three years, he caused a new church to be built at Cwmamman. The Bishop of Chester presented him to the important vicarage of Carnarvon in 1869. While there he organised a series of public meetings to protest against the exclusion of religious education from primary schools. The speeches were delivered in the Welsh language. In the same year (1869) Edwards had a long controversy in 'Y Goleuad' with a Calvinistic methodist minister on the subject of church unity. Upon the death of the Rev. James Vincent he was promoted to the deanery of Bangor, March 1876, when only thirty-nine.

He amply justified his appointment; took a foremost part in all movements tending to the welfare of the church, and especially promoted the work of the Bangor Clerical Education Society, the object of which was to supply the diocese with a body of educated clergy able to minister efficiently in the Welsh language, spoken by more than three-fourths of the people. In the work of the restoration of Bangor Cathedral he showed much energy, and in a short time raised 7,000*l.*, towards which sum he himself very liberally contributed. Among his publications that which excited the most attention was a letter entitled 'The Church of the Cymry,' addressed to Mr. W. E. Gladstone in January 1870, in which he accounted for the alienation of the great majority of the Welsh people from the established church. His name will probably be remembered for his onslaught on the tea-drinking habits of modern society, which he held to be the cause of 'the general physical deterioration of the inhabitants of these islands.' In 1883 he suffered from sleeplessness and nervousness, and was greatly depressed in spirits. He consequently went for a long cruise in the Mediterranean, but with little benefit to his health. In May 1884 he was staying with his brother, the Rev. Ebenezer Wood Edwards, at Ruabon Vicarage. He committed suicide on 24 May 1884, and was buried at Glenadda cemetery on 28 May.

He was the author of the following works: 1. 'Eight Days in the Camp, a sermon,' 1865. 2. 'The Victorious Life, sermons,' 1869. 3. 'The Church of the Cymry, a letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone,' 1870. 4. 'Cymru dan felldith Babel,' 1871. 5. 'The Babel of the Sects and the Unity of the Pentecost,' 1872. 6. 'The Position and Resources of the National Church,' 1872. 7. 'Amddiffynydd yr Eglwys,' editor and chief contributor H. T. Edwards, 1873–5. 8. 'The Exile and the Return, sermons,' 1875. 9. 'Why are the Welsh People alienated from the Church? a sermon,' 1879. 10. 'The Past and Present condition of the Church in Wales,' 1879. 11. 'Esponiad i'r pregethwr a'r athraw. Yr Efengyl yn ol Sant Matthew. Gyda Sylwadau a mwy dau gant o draethodau pregethol gan H. T. Edwards,' 1882.

[Church Portrait Journal, August 1879, pp. 71–3, with portrait; Mackeson's Church Congress Handbook (1877), pp. 76–7; Times, 26 May 1884, p. 9, 29 May, p. 6, and 11 June, p. 10; Illustrated London News, 31 May 1884, pp. 520, 523, with portrait; Guardian, 4 June 1884, p. 828.] G. C. B.

EDWARDS, HUMPHREY (*d.* 1658), regicide, was, according to Noble, a younger son of Thomas Edwards of Shrewsbury, by Ann, widow of Stephen Ducket, and daughter of Humphrey Baskerville, alderman of London. He is represented as 'having alwaies been a half-faced cavalier, changing his party for his profit.' Disappointed at not obtaining a reward for attending the king to the commons when he went to demand the five members, 4 Jan. 1642, Edwards took sides with the parliament, was elected member for Shropshire, probably in the place of Sir Richard Lee, 'disabled to sit' (*Lists of Members of Parliament, Official Return*, pt. i.

p. 492), and on being nominated one of the commissioners of the high court of justice attended each day of the trial, and signed the death-warrant. During the Commonwealth he served on the committee of revenue, and was appointed a commissioner of South Wales 25 June 1651 (*Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1651, p. 266). He hankered after the chief usher-ship of the exchequer, then held by Clement Walker, and, after vainly soliciting the committee of sequestrations to sequester Walker during his incarceration in the Tower, persuaded the committee of revenue to confer the office on him 'untill the parliament declare their pleasure therein,' by an order dated 1 Feb. 1649–50. On the following 21 March, though the order had not been ratified by parliament, he took forcible possession of Walker's official residence (*The Case between C. Walker and H. Edwards*, s. sh. fol. 1650; *The Case of Mrs. Mary Walker*, s. sh. fol. 1650). Edwards died in 1658, and was buried at Richmond on 2 Aug (parish reg.) In the letters of administration granted in P. C. C. to his sister, Lady Lucy Ottley, on 26 Oct. 1658, he is described as 'late of Richmond in the county of Surrey, a batchelor' (*Administration Act Book*, P. C. C. 1658, f. 270). Although he had died before the Restoration he was excepted out of the bill of pardon and oblivion, so that his property might be confiscated (*Commons' Journals*, viii. 61, 286). In this way a parcel of the manor of West Ham which had been acquired by him was restored to the possession of the queen (*ib.* viii. 73).

[Noble's Lives of the Regicides, i. 200–1; Cal. State Papers, Dom. 1649–50, p. 186, 1651, pp. 237, 266, 1655, p. 80; Wood's Athenæ Oxon (Bliss), iii. 864.] G. G.

EDWARDS, JAMES (1757–1816), bookseller and bibliographer, born in 1757, was the eldest son of William Edwards (1720–1808) of Halifax, who in 1784 set up James and a younger son, John, as the firm of Edwards & Sons in Pall Mall, London. John died soon afterwards, and the business was continued by James with great success. A third son, Thomas (*d.* 1834), was a bookseller in Halifax. Richard, another son, at one time held a government appointment in Minorca. Messrs. Edwards & Sons sold many valuable libraries. One sale in 1784 was formed principally from the libraries of N. Wilson of Pontefract and H. Bradshaw of Maple Hall, Cheshire. Among others dispersed in 1787 was the library of Dr. Peter Mainwaring. James accompanied in 1788 his fellow-bookseller, James Robson, to Venice, in order to examine the famous Pinelli library, which they purchased and sold by auction the following year in Conduit Street, London. In 1790 Edwards disposed of the libraries of Salichetti of Rome and Zanetti of Venice, and in 1791 that of Paris de Meyzieu. He had purchased at the Duchess of Portland's sale in 1786 the famous Bedford Missal, now in the British Museum, described by Richard Gough in 'An Account of a Rich Illuminated Missal executed for John, duke of Bedford, Regent of France under Henry VI,' 1794, 4to. This description was dedicated by the author to Edwards, 'who, with the spirit to purchase [the missal], unites the taste to possess it.' 'Let me recommend the youthful bibliomaniac to get possession of Mr. Edwards's catalogues, and especially that of 1794,' says Dibdin (*Bibliomania*, i. 123). He made frequent visits to the continent, where many of his most advantageous purchases were made. About 1804, having acquired a considerable fortune, he resolved to retire from trade, and with the Bedford Missal and other literary and artistic treasures he went to live at a country seat in the neighbourhood of Old Verulam. He was succeeded by Robert Harding Evans [q. v.] On 10 Sept. 1805 he married Katharine, the only daughter of the Rev. Edward Bromhead, rector of Reepham, Norfolk, and about the same period bought the manor-house at Harrow, where some of the archbishops of Canterbury had once lived. The house is finely situated among gardens, in which was an alcove mentioned by Dibdin, some of whose imaginary bibliomaniacal dialogues are supposed to be carried on in the surrounding grounds. Edwards was hospitable and fond of literary society. Some of his books were sold by Christie, 25–28 April 1804. The remainder, a choice collection of 830 articles, fetched the large sum of 8,467*l.* 10*s.* when it was sold by Evans 5–10 April 1815 (*Gent. Mag.* lxxxv. pt. i. pp. 135, 254, 349; and Dibdin, *Bibliographical Decameron*, 1817, iii. 111–27). He died at Harrow 2 Jan. 1816, at the age of fifty-nine, leaving five children and a widow, who afterwards married the Rev. Thomas Butt of Kinnersley, Shropshire. His last instructions were that his coffin should be made out of library shelves. A monument to his memory is in Harrow Church.

Edwards was Dibdin's 'Rinaldo, the wealthy, the fortunate, and the heroic . . . no man ever did such wonderful things towards the acquisition of rare, beautiful, and truly classical productions . . . he was probably born a bibliographical bookseller, and had always a nice feeling and accurate perception of what was tasteful and classical' (*ib.* iii. 14–16).

[Gent. Mag. lxxxvi. pt. i. 180–1; Nichols's Lit. Anecd. iii. 422, 641, v. 324, vi. 296, ix. 153, 808; Nichols's Illustrations, iv. 881–4, v. 578, viii. 457, 474, 631; Clarke's Repertorium Bibliographicum, 1819, pp. 442–6; Timperley's Encyclopædia, 1842, pp. 825, 933.] H. R. T.

EDWARDS or EDWARDES, JOHN, M.D. (*fl.*1638), Sedleian reader at Oxford (his name is written 'Edwardes' in the school register and university books), was born 27 Feb. 1600 (*School Reg.*), educated at Merchant Taylors' School, and in 1617 elected thence to a probationary fellowship at St. John's College, Oxford. He gained there the favour of the president, Dr. (afterwards Archbishop) Laud, who in 1632 obtained for him, by 'special recommendation and request,' the head-mastership of Merchant Taylors' School. He resigned this post at the close of 1634, and returning to Oxford served the office of proctor in the following year. In 1638 he was appointed Sedleian reader of natural philosophy, and proceeded to the degrees of B. and D.M. He appears to have resided in college during the troublous times that followed, and in 1642 was, with others, appointed by convocation to provide accommodation for the troopers sent to Oxford, and procure arms for the further safety of the university. His loyalty made him obnoxious to the parliament, and in 1647 he was summoned, as a delinquent, to appear before the committee of lords and commons for regulating the affairs of the university. His answers being unsatisfactory, he was placed by the visitors in 1648 for a time in custody of the provost marshal for 'manifold misdemeanours.' His fellowship was taken from him, and he was superseded in the office of Sedleian reader by Joshua Crosse of Magdalen. He was, however, permitted to receive the emoluments of the readership until Michaelmas 1649, after which date all record of him disappears. It is not probable that he survived to the Restoration, as in that case his spirited conduct and pecuniary losses would have met with recognition.

[Robinson's Reg. of Merchant Taylors' School; Oxford Mat. Reg.; Wood's Fasti, i. 477, 508, 509, and Annals; Burrows's Reg. of the Visitors of the Univ. of Oxford, 1647–58 (Camd. Soc.)] C. J. R.

EDWARDS, JOHN (SION TREREDYN) (*fl.* 1651), was the translator of the 'Marrow of Modern Divinity' into Welsh. It is described as by E. F. (Edward Fisher) [q. v.] in English, and by J. E. in Welsh, printed in London by T. Mabb and A. Coles, for William Ballard, and sold at his shop under the sign of the Bible, in Corn Street, in the city of Bristol, 1651. The dedication, to the Herberts, Morgans, Kemeys, Williams of Gwent, is dated 20 July 1650; the introduction to the reader, apologising for many errors, is dated 10 May 1651. Edwards was ejected from Tredynock in Monmouthshire.

[Rowlands's Cambrian Bibliography; Dr. Thomas Rees's Hist. of Prot. Nonconformity in Wales, 2nd ed. p. 77 note.] R. J. J.

EDWARDS, JOHN (1637–1716), Calvinistic divine, second son of Thomas Edwards, author of 'Gangræna' [q. v.], was born at Hertford 26 Feb. 1637, and admitted into Merchant Taylors' School at the age of ten. Having spent seven years there under Mr. Dugard's care, he was appointed (10 March 1653–4) sizar of St. John's College, Cambridge (*College Reg.*), which at that time was under the presidency of Dr. Anthony Tuckney, a presbyterian divine, eminent alike for his learning and love of discipline. Edwards's conduct and proficiency secured him a scholarship, and before (as well as after) graduating he was appointed a moderator in the schools. In 1657 he was admitted B.A., elected fellow 23 March 1658–9, and proceeded to the degree of M.A. in 1661. Soon afterwards he was ordained deacon by Sanderson, bishop of Lincoln, who at the same time engaged him to preach a sermon at the next ordination. In 1664 he took the charge of Trinity Church, Cambridge, where his preaching—plain, practical, and temperate—attracted much notice, and he won the good opinion of his parishioners by his sedulous ministrations among the sick during a visitation of the plague. A few years later, having taken the degree of B.D., he was chosen lecturer of Bury St. Edmunds, but retained the office only twelve months, preferring college life. His position, however, at St. John's became untenable on account of his Calvinistic views, and as he met with no sympathy from the master he resigned his fellowship and entered Trinity Hall as a fellow commoner, performing the regular exercises in civil law. But the parishioners of St. Sepulchre's, Cambridge, having invited him to be their minister, he resumed his clerical functions, and about the same time improved his worldly estate by marriage with the widow of Alderman Lane, who had been a successful attorney in the town. After declining other preferment he was presented (1683) to the vicarage of St. Peter's, Colchester, a benefice which he retained some three years until declining health and waning popularity induced him to seek retirement in a Cambridgeshire village, and to make the press rather than the pulpit the means of diffusing his opinions. In 1697 he was once more in

Cambridge, driven there, it would seem, by his need of books, and busy with his pen. In 1699 he took the degree of D.D., and until the close of his long life, which occurred on 16 April 1716, devoted himself to study and to the publication of theological works. He was left a widower in 1701, and soon afterwards married Catherine Lane (niece of his first wife's husband), who survived until 1745. Edwards's reputation as a Calvinistic divine stands high. The writer of his memoir in the 'Biographia Britannica' says that 'by his admirers he was said to have been the Paul, the Augustine, the Bradwardine, the Calvin of his age.' While acknowledging his industry, learning, and fairness in controversy, it is scarcely necessary to add that such eulogy is extravagant. Out of the forty or more works which he published between 1690 and his death, one at least merits special notice, namely, the 'Socinians' Creed,' intended to controvert Locke's 'Reasonableness of Christians, as declared in the Scriptures.' Hearne (*Coll.* i. Oxf. Hist. Soc.) says: 'I am told that Dr. John Edwards of Cambridge, author of "The Preacher" (which some say, though I think otherwise, is a very trite, silly book), has assumed to himself the honour of being author of "The Preservative against Socinianism," written by Dr. Jonathan Edwards, principal of Jesus College in Oxford.' It is likely enough that some confusion may have been made between two contemporary authors of the same name writing upon the same subject; but there seems no reason to believe that John Edwards was guilty of the charge alleged against him. His works are: 1. 'The Plague of the Heart,' a sermon, Cambridge, 1665, 4to. 2. 'Cometomantia: a Discourse of Comets [by J. E. ?],' 1684, 8vo. 3. 'A Demonstration of the Existence and Providence of God, from the Contemplation of the Visible Structure of the Greater and Lesser World,' 1690, 8vo. 4. 'An Inquiry into Four Remarkable Texts of the New Testament [Matt. ii. 23, 1 Cor. xi. 14, xv. 29, 1 Peter iii. 19, 20],' Cambridge, 1692, 8vo. 5. 'A Further Inquiry into certain Remarkable Texts,' London, 1692, 8vo. 6. 'A Discourse on the Authority, Stile, and Perfection of the Books of the Old and New Testament,' 3 vols. 1693–5, 8vo. 7. 'Some Thoughts concerning the several Causes and Occasions of Atheism, especially in the Present Age, with some brief Reflections on Socinianism and on a late Book entituled "The Reasonableness of Christianity as deliver'd in the Scriptures,"' London, 1695, 4to. 8. 'Socinianism Unmask'd,' London, 1696, 8vo. 9. 'The Socinian Creed,' London, 1697, 8vo. 10. 'Brief Remarks on Mr. Whiston's new Theory of the Earth,' 1697, 8vo. 11. 'A Brief Vindication of the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith, . . . from Mr. Lock's Reflections upon them in his "Book of Education,"' &c., 1697, 8vo. 12. 'Sermons on Special Occasions and Subjects,' 1698, 8vo. 13. '*Πολυποίκιλος Σοφία*, a Compleat History of all Dispensations and Methods of Religion,' 2 vols. London, 1699, 8vo. 14. 'The Eternal and Intrinsick Reasons of Good and Evil,' a sermon, Cambridge, 1699, 4to. 15. 'A Free but Modest Censure on the late Controversial Writings and Debates of Mr. Edwards and Mr. Locke,' 1698, 4to. 16. 'A Plea for the late Mr. Baxter, in Answer to Mr. Lobb's Charge of Socinianism,' 1699, 8vo. 17. 'Concio et Determinatio pro gradu Doctoratûs in Sacrâ Theologiâ,' Cantab., 1700, 12mo. 18. 'A Free Discourse concerning Truth and Error, especially in matters of Religion,' 1701, 8vo. 19. 'Exercitations . . . on several Important Places . . . of the Old and New Testaments,' 1702, 8vo. 20. 'The Preacher, a discourse showing what are the particular Offices and Employments of those of that character in the Church,' 3 parts, London, 1705–7, 8vo. 21. 'The Heinousness of England's Sins,' a sermon, 1707, 8vo. 22. 'One Nation; one King,' sermon on the union of England and Scotland, 1707, 8vo. 23. 'Veritas Redux: Evangelical Truths Restored,' 3 vols. London, 1707–8, 1725–6, fol. and 8vo. 24. Sermon on War, 1708, 8vo. 25. 'Four Discourses, . . . being a Vindication of my Annotations from the Doctor's [Whitby] Cavils,' 1710, 8vo. 26. 'The Divine Perfections Vindicated,' 1710, 8vo. 27. 'Great Things done for our Ancestors,' a sermon, 1710, 8vo. 28. 'The Arminian Doctrines condemn'd by the Holy Scripture, in Answer to Dr. Whitby,' 1711, 8vo. 29. 'A Brief Discourse [on Rev. ii. 4-5],' 1711, 8vo. 30. 'Some Brief Observations on Mr. Whiston's late Writings,' 1712, 8vo. 31. 'Some Animadversions on Dr. Clarke's Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity,' 1712, 8vo. 31. A supplement to the above, 1713, 8vo. 32. 'Theologia Reformata,' 2 vols. 1713, fol. 34. 'How to judge aright of the Former and Present Times,' accession sermon, 1714, 4to. 35. 'Some Brief Critical Remarks on Dr. Clarke's last papers,' 1714, 8vo. 36. 'Some New Discoveries of the Uncertainty, Deficiency, and Corruptions of Human Knowledge,' &c., 1714, 8vo. 37. 'The Doctrines controverted between Papists and Protestants . . . Considered,' 1724, 8vo. 37. 'A Discourse concerning the True Import of the words Election and Reprobation,' 1735, 8vo.

[Robinson's Reg. of Merchant Taylors' School; Wilson's Hist. of Merchant Taylors' School;

Biographia Brit.; Baker's Hist. of St. John's, Cambridge (Mayor); Brit. Mus. Lib. Cat.]

C. J. R.

EDWARDS, JOHN (Sion y Potiau) (1700?–1776), poet, born in Glyn Ceiriog in Denbighshire about 1700, was a weaver by trade, but is said in early life to have spent seven years as assistant to a bookseller in London, and during that time is supposed to have gained considerable information. He was a poet of some merit, had two sons named Cain and Abel, of whom some local poet wrote the following jingle :—

Cain ac Abel, cŷn ac ebill,
Abel a Chain, ebill a chŷn.

Cain gained some note as a publisher of almanacs. Edwards prepared his own monument, and inscribed thereon 1 Cor. xv. 52, in Latin. He died in 1776. His translation of Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress' was published in 1767–8.

[Rowlands's Cambrian Bibliography.]

R. J. J.

EDWARDS, JOHN (1714–1785), dissenting minister at Leeds, Yorkshire, was born in 1714. He published in 1758 'A Vindication of the Protestant Doctrine of Justification and its Preachers and Professors from the unjust Charge of Antinomianism; extracted from a letter of the Rev. Mr. Robt. Trail, a minister in the city of London, to a minister in the country,' his object being to testify to the world the doctrines advanced by him in his public ministry, which were the same as laid down by Trail in this letter. In 1762 appeared 'The Safe Retreat from impending Judgments,' the substance of a sermon preached by Edwards at Leeds, a second edition of which was issued in 1773. At the end of this sermon is advertised 'The Christian Indeed,' another work by the same author. Edwards also edited 'A Collection of Hymns and Spiritual Songs for the use of Serious and Devout Christians of all Denominations,' of which a second edition, 'with alterations,' was published in 1769. He died in 1785. A mezzotint portrait after J. Russell, engraved by J. Watson, is dated 1772.

[Watt's Bibl. Brit.; Brit. Mus. Cat.; Bromley's Cat. of Portraits, 360.]

A. V.

EDWARDS, JOHN (Sion Ceiriog) (1747–1792), Welsh poet, was born at Crogen Wladys in Glyn Ceiriog in 1747. He, Owen Jones (Myfyr), and Robert Hughes (Robin Ddu o Fon), were the founders of Cymdeithas y Gwyneddigion, or the Venedotian Society, 1770. Sion Ceiriog, as he was called, wrote an *awdl* (ode) for the meeting of the society on St. David's day, 1778; he was its secretary in 1779–80, and its president in 1783. He died suddenly in 1792, aged 45. John Jones, Glan-y-Gors, contributed some memorial verses to the 'Geirgrawn' of June 1796, with these prefatory remarks: 'To the memory of John Edwards, Glynceiriog, in the parish of Llangollen, Denbighshire, who was generally known as Sion Ceiriog, a poet, an orator, and an astronomer, a curious historian of sea and land, a manipulator of musical instruments, a true lover of his country and of his Welsh mother tongue, who, to the great regret of his friends, died and was buried in London, September 1792.'

[Foulkes's Geirlyfr Bywgraffiadol, 1870.]

R. J. J.

EDWARDS, JOHN (1751–1832), poetical writer, the eldest son of James Edwards of Old Court, co. Wicklow, by Anne, second daughter of Thomas Tenison, a son of Archbishop Tenison, was born in 1751. He became an officer of light dragoons in the volunteer army of Ireland, and rose to the rank of lieutenant-colonel. In honour of the force to which he belonged he wrote 'The Patriot Soldier: a Poem,' Nottingham, 1784, 4to, 38 pp. He also published 'Kathleen: a Ballad from Ancient Irish Tradition,' 1808, 4to; 'Abradates and Panthea: a Tragedy,' 1808, 8vo; 'Interests of Ireland,' London, 1815, and an essay upon the improvement of bank-notes, Liverpool, 1820. Edwards died owner of Old Court in 1832. He married Charlotte, fifth daughter of John Wright of Nottingham, who bore him three sons and two daughters.

[Burke's Landed Gentry; Watt's Bibliotheca Brit.; Creswell's Nottingham Printing, p. 38.]

A. V.

EDWARDS, JONATHAN, D.D. (1629–1712), controversialist, was born at Wrexham, Denbighshire, in 1629. He entered as a servitor at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1655, and took his B.A. degree in October 1659. In 1662 he was elected fellow of Jesus, and proceeded B.D. in March 1669. His first preferment was the rectory of Kiddington, Oxfordshire, which he exchanged in 1681 for that of Hinton-Ampner, Hampshire. On the promotion of John Lloyd, principal of Jesus College, to the bishopric of St. David's, Edwards was unanimously elected (2 Nov. 1686) his successor; he was made D.D. on 1 Dec. 1686, and held the office of vice-chancellor from 1689 to 1691. In 1687 he became treasurer of Llandaff, and was proctor for the chapter of Llandaff in the convocation of 1702. He held, apparently along with

Hinton-Ampner, a living in Anglesea, and another in Carnarvonshire.

Edwards published the first part of his 'Preservative against Socinianism' in 1693, but the work was not completed till ten years later. His fundamental position is that Faustus Socinus is not to be allowed to rank as a heretic, but treated, like Muhammad, as the founder of a new religion (pt. i. p. 7). The Socinians, who had many passages of arms with Edwards's contemporary and namesake, John Edwards, D.D. (1637–1716) [q. v.], scarcely noticed the 'Preservative;' in fact, by the time it was finished, the Socinian controversy was practically over, its place being already taken by the Arian controversy, initiated by Thomas Emlyn [q. v.] The title of Edwards's book was borrowed by Edward Nares, D.D. (1746–1841) [q. v.]

Edwards figures in the Antinomian controversy which agitated the presbyterians and independents of London, in consequence of the alleged anti-Calvinistic tendency of Dr. Daniel Williams's 'Gospel Truth,' 1691. Stephen Lobb, the independent, quoted Edwards as condemning the positions of Williams, but Edwards in a letter to Williams (dated from Jesus College, 28 Oct. 1697) justified the statements of Williams on the points in dispute. A controversy on original sin with Daniel Whitby, D.D., Edwards did not live to finish. He died 20 July 1712. He is buried in the chapel of Jesus College, to the repairs of which he had given nearly 1,000*l.* His books he left to the college library.

He published: 1. 'A Preservative against Socinianism,' &c., pt. i. Oxford, 1693, 4to; 3rd edition, 1698, 4to; pt. ii. 1694, 4to; pt. iii. MDCXDVII, i.e. 1697, 4to; pt. iv. 1703, 4to; the Index to the four parts is by Thomas Hearne. 2. 'Remarks on a Book . . . by Dr. Will. Sherlock . . . entitled, A Modest Examination of the Oxford Decree,' &c., Oxford, 1695, 4to. 3. 'The Exposition given by the Bishop of Sarum of the 2nd Article . . . examined,' 1702 (Watt). 4. 'The Doctrine of Original Sin . . . vindicated from the Exceptions . . . of D. Whitby,' Oxford, 1711, 8vo (Whitby replied in 'A Full Answer,' &c., 1712, 8vo). Edwards's letter to Williams appears at p. 70 of the latter's 'Answer to the Report which the United Ministers drew up,' &c., 1698, 12mo.

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. 1692, ii. 898; Chalmers's Biog. Dict. 1814, xiii. 52; Edwards's works.]

A. G.

EDWARDS, LEWIS, D.D. (1809–1887), Welsh Calvinistic methodist, son of a small farmer, was born at Pwllcenawon, Llanbadarn Fawr, Cardiganshire, 27 Oct. 1809. The family library was all Welsh, consisting chiefly of religious books, and of these Edwards made good use. His first school was kept by a superannuated old soldier, the second by an uncle, the third by a clergyman. At this last he began his acquaintance with Greek and Latin. His father intended him to remain at home on the farm. Probably about this time he puzzled his neighbours with metaphysical questions, asking, for instance, whether it were more proper to consider the creation as existing in God or God in creation. A neighbour induced the father to send him to resume his studies at Aberystwyth. He formed a permanent friendship with his new teacher, a Mr. Evans, who was a good mathematician. His resources failing, he set up a school on his own account. About this time he first saw an English magazine. A chance sight of 'Blackwood' gave him a strong desire to know something of English literature.

His next move was to Llangeitho, to a school kept by a Rev. John Jones. Here he read the classics and began to preach. He failed in fluency, and his voice was not good. In 1830 he left Llangeitho to become a teacher in a private family. Here he heard of the new university in London. He knew of no other open to a Calvinistic methodist, and sought the necessary permission of the association to study there. It was at last granted, but his funds only supported him in London through one winter. In 1832 he took charge of the English methodist church at Laugharne in Carmarthenshire, where he remained a year and a half, and had useful practice in speaking English. He next studied at Edinburgh, where he worked hard, and was enabled, through the intervention of Professor Wilson (Christopher North), with whom he was a great favourite, to take his degree at the end of three, instead of four, years. He returned to Wales the first of his denomination to win the degree of M.A. He was ordained at Newcastle Emlyn in 1837, and shortly after opened a school at Bala in conjunction with his brother-in-law, the Rev. David Charles [see CHARLES, THOMAS, *ad fin.*], and for fifty years was principal of what has now long been known as Bala College. In 1844 he started a small magazine, 'Yr Esponiwr' ('The Expositor'), and in January 1845 he sent forth the first number of 'Y Traethodydd' ('The Essayist'), a quarterly magazine, which has continued to appear regularly ever since. Of this he was editor for ten years, and in it some of his best essays made their first appearance. This magazine took its place at once as the best in the lan-

guage. There were essays on Homer, Goethe, Kant, Coleridge, Hamilton, Mill, &c. He was one of the most finished writers of Welsh in his day. Most of his essays were afterwards collected and published as 'Traethodau Llenyddol a Duwinyddol' ('Essays, Literary and Theological,' 1867, 2 vols. 8vo). In 1847 he started the 'Geiniogwerth' ('Pennyworth'). In 1855 he visited the continent to perfect his knowledge of German and French. His college lectures were at first chiefly classical, but gradually became more theological. He lectured on the evidences, the principles of morality, the laws of thought, the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. He did not write his lectures, but it was his habit to study each subject thoroughly, smoking the whole time. He spoke without hesitation, but slowly, so that each student could write all while listening. His best-known work is his 'Athrawiaeth yr Iawn' ('Atonement'), 1860, of which an English translation appeared in 1886; and a second edition of the original, with a memoir by his son, Principal Edwards, M.A., D.D., of Aberystwyth, in 1887. About 1862 he was offered the honorary degree of D.D. by Princeton College, U.S.A., but he declined it. His own university offered him the same degree in 1865, and he went to Edinburgh to receive it. In 1875 his friends and admirers gave him a handsome testimonial, which placed him for the future in a position of comfort. He died 19 July 1887, and his remains were interred in the same grave as those of Thomas Charles of Bala [q. v.], whose granddaughter he had married.

[Principal Edwards's Memoir, 1887.] R. J. J.

EDWARDS, RICHARD (1523?–1566), poet and playwright, a native of Somersetshire, born about 1523, was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He took his bachelor's degree in 1544, and in the same year was elected to a fellowship at Corpus. In 1547 he was nominated student of Christ Church and created M.A. At Oxford he studied music under George Etheridge. On leaving the university he entered himself at Lincoln's Inn, but does not appear to have followed the profession of the law. He became a gentleman of the Chapel Royal, and in 1561 was appointed master of the children of the chapel. In January 1564–5 a tragedy by Edwards was performed by the children of the chapel before the queen at Richmond (Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, 1879, i. 183). He attended the queen on her visit to Oxford in 1566, and composed for her entertainment the play of 'Palamon and Arcite,' which was acted in Christ Church Hall. The play (which has not come down) gave great satisfaction; the queen 'laughed heartily thereat, and gave the author . . . great thanks for his pains' (Wood). Edwards died 31 Oct. 1566 (Hawkins, *Hist. of Music*, 1853, p. 521).

Only one play of Edwards is extant, 'The excellent Comedie of two the moste faithfullest Freendes, Damon and Pithias,' &c., 1571, 4to; 2nd edition, 1582. This play, which has merely an antiquarian interest, is reprinted in the various editions of Dodsley's 'Old Plays.' Many of Edwards's poems were published in 'The Paradyse of Daynty Devises,' which first appeared in 1576 and passed through eight editions in twenty-four years. It is stated on the title-page of the anthology that the 'sundry pithie and learned inventions' were 'devised and written for the most part by M. Edwards, sometime of her majesties chapel.' Some of Edwards's poems are not without grace and tenderness. By his contemporaries he was greatly admired, and Thomas Twine proclaimed him to be

> The flower of our realm
> And Phœnix of our age.

Barnabe Googe eulogises him in 'Eglogs, Epitaphes, and Sonettes,' 1563; Turberville has an 'epitaph' on him in 'Epitaphs, Epigrams, Songs, and Sonnets,' 1567 (where the 'epitaph' by Twine also occurs); Webbe, in his 'Discourse of English Poetry,' 1586, Puttenham in his 'Art of English Poesie,' 1589, and Meres in 'Palladis Tamia,' 1598, have commendatory notices of him. A part of his song 'In Commendation of Musick' ('Where gripyng grief the hart would wound,' &c.) is given in 'Romeo and Juliet,' act iv. sc. 5. Four of his poems are preserved in Cotton MS. Tit. A. xxiv. The 'Mr. Edwardes' who wrote 'An Epytaphe of the Lord of Pembroke' (licensed in 1569) is not to be identified with the author of 'Damon and Pithias.' Warton mentions that a collection of short comic stories, printed in 1570, b.l., 'Sett forth by Maister Richard Edwardes, mayster of her maiesties revels' (Edwards was not master of the revels), was among the books of 'the late Mr. William Collins of Chichester, now dispersed.'

[Wood's Athenæ, ed. Bliss, i. 353; Reg. Univ. Oxford, i. 208; Hawkins's Hist. of Music, 1853, pp. 362, 521, 924–7; Collier's Hist. of Engl. Dram. Poetry, 1879, i. 183–4, ii. 389–93; Warton's Hist. of Engl. Poetry, ed. Hazlitt, iv. 213–220; Dodsley's Old Plays, ed. Hazlitt, vol. iv.; Collier's Bibliogr. Cat.; Ritson's Bibl. Poet.; Corser's Collectanea.] A. H. B.

EDWARDS, ROGER, D.D. (1811–1886), Welsh Calvinistic methodist, was born in 1811, the year in which the Calvinistic metho-

dists first assumed the power to ordain their own ministers; and he grew up amid the controversy over Calvin's five great points. Ebenezer Morris, John Elias, &c., were then leading lights in the denomination. In 1835 he became editor of 'Cronicl yr Oes,' perhaps the first Welsh political paper; this he conducted for four years, writing most of it himself. The leaders in the 'Chronicle' for 1836 on the 'House of Lords,' 'The Ballot,' and 'Church Rates' were strongly radical, and they brought on young Edwards the charge of socialism and sympathy with Tom Paine. From 1839 to 1874 he was secretary of the Calvinistic Methodist Association. In January 1845 appeared the first number of the 'Traethodydd,' of which he was co-editor with his namesake Lewis Edwards [q. v.] till 1855, and after that with another till his death in 1886. He was editor of the 'Drysorfa' (a magazine founded in 1779 by Thomas Charles of Bala [q. v.]), 1846–86. Besides this he published two volumes of the 'Preacher,' a hymn-book, the Welsh Psalmist; 'Methodist Diary;' James Hughes's 'Expositor,' with additional notes; Henry Rees', of Liverpool, 'Sermons,' 3 vols. He was the first to publish a serial story in Welsh; of these he wrote three.

[Memoir in Drysorfa for September and October 1886.] R. J. J.

EDWARDS, SYDENHAM TEAK (1769?–1819), natural historical draughtsman, was the son of a schoolmaster and organist at Abergavenny. Having made copies of certain plates in Curtis's 'Flora Londinensis,' they were seen by a Mr. Denham, and by him brought under the notice of William Curtis, the founder of the 'Botanical Magazine' [q. v.], who was so pleased with their execution that he sent for Edwards to London, and there had him instructed in drawing. From 1798 onwards Edwards made nearly the whole of the drawings for the 'Botanical Magazine,' and several for the 'Flora Londinensis.' He accompanied Curtis on various excursions, that the plants and animals they found might be drawn from life. His patron died in 1799, but Edwards continued to furnish the 'Botanical Magazine' with drawings, and he also issued six parts of 'Cynographia Britannica, consisting of Coloured Engravings of the various Breeds of Dogs in Great Britain,' &c., London, 1800–5, 4to. He also supplied the plates of a serial publication, the 'New Botanic Garden,' which began in 1805, was completed in 1807, and was reissued by a different publisher in 1812 with text, the title being altered to 'The New Flora Britannica.' In 1814 Edwards was induced to withdraw from the 'Botanical Magazine,' and to start the 'Botanical Register,' the text of which was at first contributed by J. B. Ker-Gawler, and at a later period by Dr. John Lindley. Edwards died at Queen's Elms, Brompton, 8 Feb. 1819, in his fifty-first year.

[General Index, Bot. Mag. (1828), pp. x–xii; Gent. Mag. (1819), vol. lxxxix. pt. i. p. 188.] B. D. J.

EDWARDS, THOMAS (*fl.* 1595), poet, was the author of two long narrative poems, 'Cephalus and Procris' and 'Narcissus,' issued in a single volume by John Wolfe in 1595. The book is dedicated to 'Thomas Argall, Esquire,' and although Edwards's name does not appear on the title-page, it is appended to the prefatory matter and to the end of each poem. As early as 22 Oct. 1593 'a booke entytuled "Procris and Cephalus," divided into foure partes,' was entered in the Stationers' registers and licensed to Wolfe. A passage in Thomas Nashe's 'Have with you to Saffron Walden' (1596) referred to the poem, and was until recently misinterpreted to imply that Anthony Chute [q. v.] was its author. Mention is also made of a poem called 'Cephalus and Procris' in W[illiam] C[lerke]'s 'Polimanteia,' 1595. The work has only lately come to light. In 1867 a fragment was discovered in Sir Charles Isham's library at Lamport Hall, Nottingham; in 1878 a complete copy, and the only one known, was found in the Peterborough Cathedral Library. The latter was reprinted, with elaborate critical apparatus, by Mr. W. E. Buckley for the Roxburghe Club in 1882. 'Cephalus and Procris' is in heroic couplets, 'Narcissus' in seven-line stanzas; Ovid's stories are for the most part followed, but there is much originality in the general treatment, and real poetic feeling throughout. Each poem concludes with a lyrical envoy; that to 'Narcissus' refers in appreciative terms to Spenser, Daniel, Watson, and Marlowe under the names 'Collyn,' 'Rosamond,' 'Amintas,' and 'Leander.' 'Adon,' another of Edwards's heroes, is probably Shakespeare. The poet is doubtless identical with a Thomas Edwards who contributed to Adrianus Romanus's 'Parvum Theatrum Urbium,' Frankfort, 1595, fifty-five Latin hexameters on the cities of Italy (reprinted and translated in Robert Vilvain's 'Enchiridium Epigrammatum Latino-Anglicum,' London, 1654). Two short poems signed 'Edwardes,' from Tanner MS. 306, f. 175, are printed as by the author of 'Cephalus and Procris' in Mr. Buckley's volume.

There is some reason to suppose that the poet was an Oxford man, but it is not possible

to identify him with certainty. The name is a common one. One Thomas Edwards, of a Berkshire family, became fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, in 1579, proceeded B.A. on 26 March 1582, B.C.L. on 19 Nov. 1584, and D.C.L. on 17 Dec. 1590. He was afterwards, according to Wood, chancellor to the Bishop of London, and gave a few books to the Bodleian Library and to Christ Church.

A second Thomas Edwards (probably of Queens' College, Cambridge, B.A. 1578–9, M.A. 1582) became rector of Langenhoe, Essex, on 1 Oct. 1618; a third, the author of 'Gangræna' is noticed below; a fourth was buried in Westminster Abbey on 21 April 1624; a fifth had a son of the same name, who entered the Inner Temple in 1647; a sixth, a schoolmaster, is the subject of a poem in the Tanner MSS.

[Rev. W. E. Buckley's Cephalus and Procris (Roxburghe Club), 1882, contains all accessible information.] S. L. L.

EDWARDS, THOMAS (1599–1647), puritan divine and author of 'Gangræna,' born in 1599, was educated at Queens' College, Cambridge, and in due course proceeded to the two degrees in arts. On 14 July 1623 he was incorporated at Oxford University, but he continued to reside at Cambridge, where, after taking orders, he was appointed a university preacher, and earned the name of 'Young Luther.' In February 1627 he preached a sermon in which he counselled his hearers not to seek carnal advice when in doubt; declared he would testify and teach no other doctrine though the day of judgment were at hand, and was committed to prison until he could find bonds for his appearance before the ecclesiastical courts. After being frequently summoned before the courts, he on 31 March 1628 received an order to make a public recantation of his teaching in St. Andrew's Church, with which he complied on 6 April, a document to that effect being drawn up and signed by the curate of the parish. Edwards did not remain much longer at Cambridge, and in the following year one of his name, who was in all probability the same, was licensed to preach in St. Botolph's, Aldgate, London (Newcourt, *Repert. Eccl.* i. 916). His nonconformist tendencies very soon excited attention, and it must have been shortly after his appointment that he found himself among those 'suppressed or suspended' by Laud (Prynne, *Cant. Doome*, ed. 1646, p. 373). On regaining his liberty to preach, he recommenced his campaign against 'popish innovations and Arminian tenets' at various city churches, at Aldermanbury, and in Coleman Street. In July 1640, on the delivery at Mercers' Chapel of a sermon which he himself describes (*Gangr.* i. 75) as 'such a poor sermon as never a sectary in England durst have preached in such a place and at such a time,' an attachment was issued against him, and he was prosecuted in the high commission court, but with what result is not known. In alluding to this incident Edwards summarises his controversial attitude at this time in the following words: 'I never had a canonicall coat, never gave a peny to the building of Paul's, took not the canonicall oath, declined subscription for many years before the parliament (though I practised the old conformity), would not give *ne obolum quidem* to the contributions against the Scots, but dissuaded other ministers; much lesse did I yeeld to bow at the altar, and at the name of Jesus, or administer the Lord's Supper at a table turned altarwise, or bring the people up to rails, or read the Book of Sports, or highly flatter the archbishop in an epistle dedicatory to him, or put articles into the high commission court against any.' When the parliament took the government into their own hands, and the presbyterian party was in the ascendant, Edwards came forward as one of their most zealous supporters, not only preaching, praying, and stirring up the people to stand by them, but even advancing money (*ib.* pt. i. p. 2). He refused, he tells us (*ib.* pt. iii. pref.), many great livings, preferring to preach in various localities where he considered his services were most needed. Christchurch, London, Hertford, Dunmow, and Godalming were among the places which he more frequently visited, and at one time he was in the habit of making three or four journeys a week between the last-named town and London. As a rule he refused to be paid for his sermons, and he boasted that, notwithstanding his constant preaching, he had for the two years 1645–6 received no more than 40*l.* per annum. He could, however, afford to be indifferent in the matter of payment, since he had married a lady who brought with her a considerable fortune. As soon as the independents began to come prominently forward Edwards attacked them with unexampled fury from the pulpit, and in 1644 published 'Antapologia, or a full Answer to the Apologeticall Narration of Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Sympson, Mr. Burroughes, Mr. Bridge, Members of the Assembly of Divines,' wherein are handled many of the controversies of these times, containing a violent indictment of the divines named on the title-page, but mild and reasonable by comparison with his next work. This was 'Gangræna; or a Catalogue and Discovery of many Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies, and pernicious Practices of the

Sectaries of this Time, vented and acted in England in these four last Years,' which appeared on 16 Feb. 1646. Sixteen sorts of sectaries were enumerated, 180 errors or heresies, and twenty-eight alleged malpractices, the book concluding with an outcry against toleration, which wellnigh exhausted the language of abuse. The sensation produced by 'Gangræna' was immense. A second edition was called for immediately, and answers to it were published in great numbers. The most important of these were from the pens of Lilburne, Saltmarsh, Walwyn, and John Goodwin (whose 'Cretensis; or a briefe Answer to an Ulcerous Treatise . . . intituled "Gangræna,"' was published anonymously), and to these Edwards replied the same year with 'The Second Part of Gangræna; or a fresh and further Discovery of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies, and dangerous Proceedings of the Sectaries of this Time.' In this work there is a catalogue of thirty-four errors not previously mentioned, and a number of letters from ministers throughout the country giving evidence in support of Edwards's charges against the independents. The publication was followed by a fresh crop of pamphlets, and again Edwards retaliated with 'The Third Part of Gangræna; or a new and higher Discovery of Errours,' &c. The resentment created by these successive attacks on the dominant party was so great that Edwards in 1647 judged it wise to retire to Holland, where, almost immediately on his arrival, he was seized with an ague, from which he died on 24 Aug. He left a daughter and four sons, the second of whom was John Edwards, 1637–1716 [q. v.].

Any controversial value which Edwards's work might possess is almost entirely set at nought by the unrestrained virulence of his language, and the intemperate fury with which he attacked all whose theological opinions differed, however slightly, from his own. He did not hesitate to make outrageous charges on the personal character of his opponents, and throughout his manner is far more maledictory than argumentative. Fuller (*Appeal of Injured Innocence*, pt. vii. p. 502, ed. 1659) remarks: 'I knew Mr. Edwards very well, my contemporary in Queens' Colledge, who often was transported beyond due bounds with the keenness and eagerness of his spirit, and therefore I have just cause in some things to suspect him.' Milton, whose doctrine of divorce was error No. 154 in the first part of 'Gangræna,' refers to him in his lines 'On the New Forcers of Conscience under the Long Parliament:'—

Men whose life, learning, faith, and pure intent
Would have been held in high esteem by Paul,
Must now be named and printed heretics
By shallow Edwards.

Jeremiah Burroughes (*Vindication*, p. 2, ed. 1646) writes of him: 'I doubt whether there ever was a man who was looked upon as a man professing godliness that ever manifested so much boldness and malice against others whom he acknowledged to be religious persons. That fiery rage, that implacable, irrational violence of his against godly persons, makes me stand and wonder.'

Minor works written by Edwards were: 1. 'Reasons against the Independent Government of particular Congregations,' 1641, answered by Katherine Chidley. 2. 'A Treatise of the Civil Power of Ecclesiasticals, and of Suspension from the Lord's Supper,' 1642. 3. 'The Casting down of the last Stronghold of Satan, or a Treatise against Toleration and pretended Liberty of Conscience' (the first part), 1647. 4. 'The Particular Visibility of the Church,' 1647. Of these Nos. 2 and 4 are not in the library of the British Museum, but are assigned to Edwards by Wood (*Fasti Oxon.* i. 413).

[Brook's Lives of the Puritans, ed. 1813, iii. 82; Hook's Eccl. Biog. ed. 1847, iii. 557; Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, iii. 120, 310; Wood's Fasti Oxon. (Bliss), i. 413; Biog. Brit. (Kippis), sub voc. and sub 'Edwards, John;' Gangræna, passim.]

A. V.

EDWARDS, THOMAS (1652-1721), divine and orientalist, born at Llanllêchid, near Bangor, Carnarvonshire, in 1652, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took the two degrees in arts, B.A. 1673, M.A. 1677 (*Cantab. Graduati*, 1787, p. 128). In the early part of his life he lived with Dr. Edmund Castell [q. v.], and in 1685 he was engaged by Dr. John Fell, dean of Christ Church and bishop of Oxford, to assist in the impression of the New Testament in Coptic, almost finished by Dr. Thomas Marshall. At the same time he became chaplain of Christ Church. He was presented to the rectory of Aldwinckle All Saints, Northamptonshire, in 1707, and died in 1721. He left a Coptic lexicon ready for the press, and published 1. 'A Discourse against Extemporary Prayer,' 8vo, London, 1703. Edmund Calamy referred to this book in support of his charge of apostasy against Theophilus Dorrington [q. v.] (*Defence of Moderate Nonconformity*, 1703, pt. i. p. 257). Edwards retorted fiercely in 2. 'Diocesan Episcopacy proved from Holy Scripture; with a letter to Mr. Edmund Calamy in the room of a dedicatory epistle,' 8vo, London, 1705.

[Works; Bridges's Northamptonshire (Whalley), ii. 210, 211.]

G. G.

EDWARDS, THOMAS (1699–1757), critic, was born in 1699. His father and grandfather had been barristers, and Edwards, after a private education, was entered at Lincoln's Inn, where he took chambers in 1721. We learn from one of his sonnets upon 'a family picture' that all his four brothers and four sisters died before him. His father dying when he was a young man, he inherited a good estate. He preferred literature to law, and resided chiefly upon his paternal estate at Pitshanger, Middlesex. In 1739 he bought an estate at Turrick, Ellesborough, Buckinghamshire, where he resided from 1740 till his death. He was elected F.S.A. 20 Oct. 1745. Edwards is chiefly known by his controversy with Warburton. A correspondent of the 'Gentleman's Magazine' (lii. 288) states, upon the alleged authority of Edwards himself, that he was educated at Eton, and elected to a fellowship at King's College, Cambridge, and was allowed to retain his fellowship after accepting a commission in the army. While a young officer, it is added, he met Warburton at Ralph Allen's house, Prior Park, and confuted him in a question of Greek criticism, showing that Warburton had been misled by trusting to a French translation. As Edwards was only a year younger than Warburton, was never at Eton or King's College, was probably never in the army, and had certainly been a barrister for twenty years when Warburton first made Allen's acquaintance (1741), the story is chiefly apocryphal. Edwards is said to have first attacked Warburton in a 'Letter to the Author of a late Epistolary Dedication addressed to Mr. Warburton,' 1744. In 1747, upon the appearance of Warburton's edition of Shakespeare, Edwards published a 'Supplement,' which reached a third edition in 1748, and was then called 'The Canons of Criticism, and a Glossary, being a Supplement to Mr. Warburton's edition of Shakspear, collected from the Notes in that celebrated work and proper to be bound up with it. By the other Gentleman of Lincoln's Inn.' The first 'Gentleman of Lincoln's Inn' was Philip Carteret Webb, who published a pamphlet under that name in 1742. The 'Canons of Criticism' reached a sixth edition in 1758 and a seventh edition in 1765. It professes to carry out a plan which Warburton, as he says in his preface, had once contemplated, of giving explicitly his 'Canons of Criticism.' It is a very brilliant exposure of Warburton's grotesque audacities. Johnson, who had a kindness for Warburton, admits that Edwards made some good hits, but compares him to a fly stinging 'a stately horse' (Croker, *Boswell*, ii. 10). Edwards's assault was 'allowed (as Warton says) by all impartial critics to have been decisive and judicious.' Warburton retorted by a note in a fresh edition of the 'Dunciad,' which greatly annoyed Edwards, who took it for an attack upon his gentility, and replied indignantly in a preface to later editions. Warburton disavowed this meaning, but in very offensive terms, in further notes (Pope, *Works*, 1751, i. 188, v. 288, notes to *Essay on Criticism* and *Dunciad*). Other opponents of Warburton naturally sympathised with Edwards, and Akenside addressed an ode to him upon the occasion.

Edwards was a writer of sonnets, of which about fifty are collected in the last editions of the 'Canons of Criticism,' many from Dodsley's and Pearch's collections. They are of very moderate excellence, but interesting as being upon the Miltonic model, and attempts at a form of poetry which was then entirely neglected. One of them is an answer to an ode from the 'sweet linnet,' Mrs. Chapone. Most of the others are complimentary addresses to his acquaintance. Edwards had a large number of literary friends, with whom he kept up a correspondence. Among them were R. O. Cambridge, Thomas Birch, Isaac Hawkins Browne, Arthur and George Onslow, Daniel Wray, and Samuel Richardson. Many of his letters are printed in the third volume of Richardson's correspondence. Six volumes of copies of his letters now in the Bodleian Library include these, with unpublished letters to Richardson, Wilkes, and others. Richard Roderick, F.R.S. and F.S.A., of Queens' College, Cambridge, was another intimate friend, who helped him in the 'Canons of Criticism.' Edwards died 3 Jan. 1757 while visiting Richardson at Parson's Green. He was buried in Ellesborough churchyard, where there is an epitaph by his 'two nephews and heirs, Joseph Paice and Nathaniel Mason.' To the 'Canons of Criticism' (1758) is annexed an 'Account of the Trial of the letter Y, alias Y.' He also wrote a tract, published after his death, called 'Free and Candid Thoughts on the Doctrine of Predestination,' 1761. It 'contained nothing new.'

[Notice prefixed to Canons of Criticism, 1758; Biog. Brit.; Richardson's Correspondence (1804), iii. 1–139; Letters in Bodleian; Watson's Warburton, pp. 322–35; Nichols's Anecdotes, ii. 198–200, ix. 623; Nichols's Illustr. iv. 531–2.]

L. S.

EDWARDS, THOMAS (1729–1785), divine, son of Thomas Edwards, born at Coventry in August 1729, was educated at the free grammar school there. In 1747 he entered

Clare Hall, Cambridge, and proceeded B.A. 1750, M.A. 1754, and was subsequently fellow of Clare. He was ordained deacon 1751, and priest 1753, by Dr. F. Cornwallis, bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. In 1755 he published 'A New English Translation of the Psalms,' &c. (*Monthly Review*, xii. 485), and in 1758 a sermon preached at St. Michael's. In 1758 he became master of the free grammar school and rector of St. John the Baptist, Coventry. In this year he married Ann Barrott.

In 1759 Edwards published 'The Doctrine of Irresistible Grace proved to have no foundation in the Writings of the N. T.,' a book of some importance in the Calvinist and Arminian controversy, and in 1762 'Prolegomena in Libros Veteris Testamenti Poeticos' (*ib.* xx. 32-5), to which he added an attack upon Dr. Lowth's 'Metricæ Harianæ brevis Confutatio,' which led to a controversy of some length. In 1766 he proceeded D.D., and in 1770 was presented to Nuneaton in Warwickshire, where he passed the rest of his life, having severed his connection with Coventry in 1779. He lost his wife in 1784, and dying in June 1785 was buried at Foleshill. He was of a mild and benevolent temper, and fond of retirement. His chief friend was Dr. E. Law, bishop of Carlisle. His other works are: 1. 'Epistola ad doctissimum R. Lowthium,' 1765. 2. Two Dissertations, 1767. 3. 'Duæ Dissertationes,' 1768. 4. 'The Indispensable Duty of Contending for the Faith,' 1773. 5. 'Selecta quædam Theocriti Idyllia' (350 lines of Theocritus, 250 pages of notes, and 20 pages of addenda, &c.)

[Kippis's Biog. Brit. 1793, v. 559; Monthly Review, l. c. et passim; Cantabrigienses Graduati, p. 128; R. Lowth's De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum, 3rd ed. pp. 473-6; Watt's Bibl. Brit. 1824, p. 331.] N. D. F. P.

EDWARDS, THOMAS, LL.D. (*fl.* 1810), divine, was son of Thomas Edwards (1729–1785) [q. v.] He graduated LL.B. in 1782 from Clare College, Cambridge. In 1787 he was a fellow of Jesus College, and took his LL.D. degree. He published 1. Plutarch, 'De Educatione Liberorum,' with notes, 1791, 8vo. 2. 'A Discourse on the Limits and Importance of Free Inquiry in matters of Religion,' Bury, 1792, 8vo. 3. 'Remarks on Dr. Kipling's Preface to Beza,' part i. 1793, 8vo. 4. 'Criticisms relating to the Dead,' London, 1810, 8vo. 5. Various sermons. N. Nisbett, rector of Tunstall, made several attacks upon Edwards's biblical criticisms.

[Brit. Mus. Cat.; Cooper's Memorials of Cambridge, i. 43.]

EDWARDS, THOMAS (1775?–1845), legal writer, born about 1775, studied at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he proceeded LL.B. in 1800 and LL.D. in 1805. He was also a fellow of Trinity Hall, and was admitted advocate at Doctors' Commons. Edwards was a magistrate for the county of Surrey, and took considerable interest in questions connected with the improvement of the people. He died at the Grove, Carshalton, on 29 Oct. 1845. Edwards wrote: 1. 'Reports of Cases argued and determined in the High Court of Admiralty; commencing with the Judgments of Sir William Scott, Easter Term, 1808,' 1812; reprinted in America. 2. 'A Letter to the Lord-lieutenant of the County of Surrey on the Misconduct of Licensing Magistrates and the consequent Degradation of the Magistracy,' 1825. 3. 'Reasons for Refusing to Sign the Lay Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury,' 2nd edition, 1835 (concerning the ritual of the church).

[Cat. of Cambr. Grad.; Gent. Mag. December 1845, p. 662; Brit. Mus. Cat.] F. W–T.

EDWARDS, THOMAS (Caerfallwch), (1779–1858), Welsh author, born in 1779 at Northop in Flintshire, was apprenticed at fourteen to a saddler named Birch, and in this family he cultivated his taste for Welsh literature. He married in 1801 or 1802, and by this means was enabled to improve his condition very materially. He removed to London and became a secretary to one Bell first of all, and afterwards to Nathaniel M. Rothschild. In 1838 he was selected with five others, in connection with the Abergavenny Eisteddfod, to improve the Welsh orthography. Nothing, however, came from the united action of these men; but in 1845 Edwards published his 'Analysis of Welsh Orthography.' He was for many years a member of the 'Cymmrodorion' and delivered many of their lectures; that on 'Currency' was afterwards published. But his great work was his 'English and Welsh Dictionary,' published by Evans (Holywell), 1850, second edition 1864. Another edition was published in the United States of America. This is considered by some authorities the best dictionary in the language. He was a frequent contributor to the Welsh magazines of the day. He was married three times. He died at 10 Cloudesley Square, London, 4 June 1858, and was interred in Highgate cemetery.

[Foulkes's Geirlyfr Bywgraffiadol.] R. J. J.

EDWARDS, WILLIAM (1719–1789), bridge-builder, youngest son of a farmer of the same name, was born in 1719 at Eglwys-

ilan, Glamorganshire. The skill which he displayed in the construction of 'dry' walls for his father's fields early attracted notice, and at the age of twenty he was employed to build a large iron forge at Cardiff. During his stay in Cardiff, where he erected many similar buildings, he lodged with a blind baker who taught him the English language. In 1746, having in the meantime returned to his native parish, he undertook to build a bridge over the river Taff. The bridge was built on piers, and in two and a half years it was washed away by a flood which drove heavy objects against the piers. Edwards had given sureties to a large amount that the bridge should stand for seven years, and at once set about its reconstruction. He now resolved to build a bridge of a single arch of 140 feet span. He carried out this plan; but no sooner was the arch completed than the immense pressure on the haunches of the bridge forced the keystones out of their place, and rendered his work useless. In 1751 he recommenced his task on a new principle of his own invention. He retained the single arch, but perforated each of the haunches with three cylindrical openings running right through, by which means the pressure was so reduced as to render the masonry perfectly secure. The bridge was finally finished in 1755, and was greatly admired. It was claimed for it that it was the longest and most beautiful bridge of a single span in the world. The success of this work procured for Edwards other contracts of the same kind, and a number of the principal bridges in South Wales were erected by him. These included three bridges over the Towy, the Usk bridge, Bettws and Llandovery bridges in Carmarthenshire, Aberavon bridge in Glamorganshire, and Glasbury bridge, near Hay in Brecknockshire. Though none of his later efforts were more picturesque than his bridge over the Taff, they were more convenient, as the great height of the arch made the approaches to the summit a very steep slope. He discovered that when there was no danger of the abutments giving way, it was possible to construct arches describing much smaller segments, and of far less than the customary height. The style of Edwards's masonry was peculiar, being similar to that employed in far earlier times, and he admitted that he acquired it by the careful study of the ruins of the old castle of Caerphilly, which was situated in the parish of Eglwysilan. Throughout his life he carried on the occupation of a farmer in addition to his bridge-building. He also officiated as minister in his parish meeting-house, having been ordained, according to the practice of the Welsh independents, in 1750. His sermons, which were always in the Welsh language, were considered very effective. He died in 1789, leaving six children. Three of his four sons were trained to their father's trade, and David, the second, inherited a large portion of his skill. Among the bridges built by David were that at Llandilo over the Towy, and Newport bridge over the Usk.

[Malkin's Scenery of South Wales, pp. 83–94 (where there is an engraving of the Taff bridge); Williams's Eminent Welshmen, p. 133; Georgian Era, iv. 501.] A. V.

EDWARDS, WILLIAM CAMDEN (1777–1855), engraver, was born in Monmouthshire in 1777. Early in the nineteenth century he went to Bungay in Suffolk to engrave portraits and illustrations for the Bible, 'Pilgrim's Progress,' and similar works published by Mr. Brightly of that place. He left Bungay after Brightly's death, but eventually returned and settled there until his death on 22 Aug. 1855. He was buried in the cemetery of Holy Trinity, Bungay. A complete series of his engravings and etchings was in the collection of Mr. Dawson Turner. Edwards was very industrious, and his productions were of the most varied description; the majority of his plates were portraits, in which he excelled. Among these were Sir Joshua Reynolds, Dr. Johnson, after Reynolds, Sir William Chambers, after Reynolds, Flaxman, after J. Jackson, Hogarth, after himself, Fuseli, after Sir Thomas Lawrence, James Hogg, after C. Fox, D. Sayers, after Opie, and many others. Among his other plates were 'Milton and his Daughters,' after Romney, a landscape after Salvator Rosa, and 'The Head of St. John the Baptist on a Charger,' from a picture in Mr. Dawson Turner's collection.

[Note by Mr. Dawson Turner in the sale catalogue of his collection; monumental inscription at Bungay, and other information per the Rev. T. K. Weatherhead, St. Mary's, Bungay.] L. C.

EDWARDSTON, THOMAS (*d.* 1396), Augustinian friar, is said to have been born at a place called Edwardston in Suffolk, whence he derived his name. He studied at Oxford, where he obtained the D.D. degree. He became a friar eremite of the order of St. Augustine at the monastery of Clare in his native county, and was eventually made prior. He was confessor to Lionel, duke of Clarence, and accompanied him to Italy on the occasion of his marriage with the daughter of the Duke of Milan. On his return to England, Edwardston took over the charge of archiepiscopal duties, but in what diocese is not known; it was probably in a temporary vacancy, for it does not appear that he was ever raised to

the full dignity of an archbishop. He died at Clare 20 May 1396, and was buried in his monastery. He was the author of 'Sermones Solemnes,' 'Determinationes Theologicæ,' and 'Lecturæ Scholasticæ.'

[Fuller's Worthies, Suffolk, p. 59; Tanner's Bibl. Brit. p. 252; Stevens's Hist. of Abbeys and Monasteries, ii. 219; Bale's Scriptt. Brit. Cat. i. 513.] A. V.

EDWIN or **EADWINE**, Lat. ÆDUINUS (585?–633), king of Northumbria, son of Ælla, king of Deira, was three years old when, after his father's death in 588, he was forced to flee from Deira by the Bernician king, Æthelric, who conquered the country and ruled over both the Northumbrian kingdoms. He, perhaps, first found shelter in Gwynedd, or North Wales, and after some wanderings was received by Cearl, king of the Mercians, who gave him his daughter Coenburh to wife. By her he had two sons, Osfrith and Eadfrith, born during his exile. Æthelric's son and successor, Æthelfrith, sought to get him into his power, and probably made it unsafe for him to remain longer in Mercia, for in 617 he sought refuge with Rædwald, king of the East-Angles, who promised that he should be safe with him. As soon as Æthelfrith heard that he was with Rædwald, he sent messengers to the East-Anglian king offering him a large sum of money if he would slay his guest, and when his offer was refused sent a second and a third embassy with larger offers and with threats of war. Rædwald promised either to slay the exile or to deliver him to his enemy. The promise was heard by one of Eadwine's friends, who came to him in the evening, called him from his sleeping-chamber, and when he had come out of doors told him of the king's intentions and offered to guide him to a place of safety. Eadwine's greatness of soul is shown by his reply: 'he would not,' he said, 'be the first to treat the king's pledge as worthless; up to that time Rædwald had done him no wrong and he would not distrust him; but if he was to die, it were better that the king should slay him than any meaner man; he had sought refuge in every part of Britain, and was weary of wandering.' He spent the night in the open air in doubt and sorrow, and as he sat on a stone in front of the palace a man of foreign mien and in a foreign garb drew near to him, and asked him why he sat there at that hour of night. When Eadwine answered that it was nothing to him, the stranger declared that he knew the cause of his trouble, and asked what he would give to one who should persuade Rædwald to change his mind, and would promise that he should have greater power than all the kings that had reigned over the English race; would he listen to the counsel of such a one when he bade him live a nobler life than any of his house? Eadwine gave the required promise, and the stranger laid his right hand upon his head, saying: 'When this sign shall come to thee, remember this hour and my words,' and then vanished so quickly that Eadwine was sure that it was a spirit that had appeared to him. Soon afterwards his friend came to him again and told him that the king had changed his intentions, and had resolved to keep faith with him, and that this change had been brought about by the queen, who had remonstrated privately with her husband on the treachery he contemplated. The stranger who appeared to Eadwine was doubtless the Roman priest Paulinus, who seems to have come from Kent to East Anglia about this time; for Rædwald had been baptised, though he had in a measure relapsed. Paulinus had, of course, heard how matters stood, and hoped by this interview with Eadwine to prepare the way for the evangelisation of the north in case Eadwine overcame his enemy. And it is not unlikely that Rædwald's seeming intention to betray his guest was only a device to deceive Æthelfrith; for almost as soon as the messengers of the Northumbrian king had returned, the East-Anglian army attacked him, before he had time to gather his whole force together, and he was defeated and slain in a battle on the eastern bank of the river Idle.

The victory of Rædwald gave Eadwine his father's kingdom of Deira, and he at once made war on Bernicia, drove Æthelfrith's sons, and a large number of young nobles who adhered to them, to take refuge among the Picts or the Scots of Dalriada, and ruled over a united Northumbrian kingdom, making York the centre of his government. He appears to have extended his dominions northwards and to have fortified Edinburgh (Eadwinesburh), which seems to preserve his name (SKENE, *Celtic Scotland*, i. 240). On the west he conquered from the Britons the kingdom of Elmet, which may be described as roughly represented by the West Riding of Yorkshire, perhaps raised the earthworks at Barwick, and had a royal residence at the ruined Campodunum, which has been identified both with Doncaster and with Tanfield on the Yore (NENNIUS, p. 53; BÆDA, *Hist. Eccles.* ii. c. 14; *Making of England*, pp. 253–257; *Archæologia*, i. 221; *Fasti Eboracenses*, p. 43). The conquest of Elmet may have led to that of the southern part of the present Lancashire, and also of Chester (GREEN), for

Eadwine's power extended to the western sea, and he conquered the isles of Anglesea and Man (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. c. 5). At the same time it must be remembered that Chester had been conquered by Æthelfrith, Eadwine's predecessor, and that some of the glory which Bæda ascribes to Eadwine must have been the fruit of Æthelfrith's victory in 613. After Rædwald's death, which happened soon after his victory on the Idle, the East-Anglian power declined, and Eadwine gained authority over the Trent valley, his superiority was acknowledged by the East-Anglian king, and he had a 'mastery over Mid-Britain' (GREEN). In 625 he married Æthelburh, sister of Eadbald [q. v.], king of Kent, and daughter of Æthelberht, the convert of Augustine. As Eadbald was at first unwilling to give his sister to a heathen, Eadwine promised that she and her attendants should have full liberty to practise their religion, and held out hopes that he would adopt it if on examination it commended itself to him. Eadburh was therefore accompanied to her future husband's court by Paulinus, who was ordained bishop before he left Kent, and other companions. Soon after his marriage Eadwine received a letter from Boniface V, exhorting him to give heed to the teaching of Paulinus, to accept the queen's religion, and to cast away his idols. With the letter the pope sent some costly robes, and also a letter to Æthelburh, to encourage her in her efforts for her husband's conversion, and with it a silver mirror and an ivory comb inlaid with gold (Bæda quotes these letters somewhat too late in his account of Eadwine, 626-7, for Boniface died on 22 Oct. 625). The extension of Eadwine's power to the south and his alliance with Kent threatened the independence of Wessex, and in 626 Cwichelm [q. v.], the West-Saxon king, sent an assassin named Eumer to slay him with a poisoned dagger. Eumer found the king holding his court on the Derwent on 17 April, and on pretence of bringing a message from his master gained admission to the king's presence and rushed upon him with his dagger. Lilla, one of the king's thegns who was dear to him, saw his lord's danger, and as he had no shield placed his own body in front of Eadwine and received Eumer's blow, which was given with so much force that the weapon, after passing through the body of the faithful thegn and slaying him on the spot, wounded the king. In the night the queen was delivered of a daughter named Eanflæd [q. v.] Paulinus heard Eadwine give thanks to his gods for his daughter's birth, and told him that he ought rather to give thanks to Christ that his queen had been preserved in great peril. The king was pleased and declared that he would renounce his idols and serve Christ, if he would give him victory over the West-Saxon king, and to show that he was in earnest he allowed Paulinus to baptise his daughter and eleven members of his household. He defeated the West-Saxons, and his victory extended his over-lordship over the whole of England except Kent, which was in alliance with him, so that he is reckoned by Bæda as the fifth of the monarchs, called in the 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' 'Bretwalda,' who had supremacy over the other kings of the English (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. c. 5; *A.-S. Chron.*, sub an. 827).

Although Eadwine did not worship idols after he made his promise to Paulinus, he did not embrace christianity immediately upon his victory over the West-Saxons, but put himself under the teaching of Paulinus, consulted with his chief counsellors on the matter, and constantly meditated alone on the course he should take. Paulinus saw that he was of too haughty a spirit readily to accept the religion of Christ, and accordingly reminded him of the promise he had made to the stranger who appeared to him when he was in trouble at Rædwald's court. He placed his right hand upon his head and asked whether he recognised the sign, evidently still leaving him to imagine that he had seen a ghostly messenger whose visit had been revealed to the bishop (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. c. 12, 17). The king trembled and would have fallen at his feet, but he raised him up, and, bidding him remember how he had thrice pledged his word, exhorted him to delay no longer to gain salvation from the eternal torments of the wicked. Eadwine answered that he would accept christianity, and held a meeting of his witan in order to persuade them to be baptised with him. After some discourse he began to ask them singly whether they would consent. The first to answer was his chief priest, Coifi, who declared that he would do so because he had gained nothing by his devout worship of the old gods, and hoped that the new religion might be more profitable to him. Next, one of the king's chief nobles replied by comparing the life of man to a sparrow that on some winter's night might fly in at a door of the hall where the king was feasting with his ealdormen and thegns, be for a moment in the warmth and light, and then fly out by another door again into the darkness and tempest. 'Even so,' he said, 'it is with our life; we know not whence it came or whither it goeth. Wherefore if this new teaching can tell us aught of these things, we should do well to accept it.' Others spoke to the same effect, and lastly Coifi

declared that the words of Paulinus seemed to him to be true, and proposed that the king should agree that the heathen temples and altars should be burnt. Eadwine gave public permission to Paulinus to preach, allowed Coifi to profane and burn the temple at Godmundham, near Market Weighton, where probably the assembly was held, and on Easter Sunday, 12 April 627, was baptised, together with his sons Osfrith and Eadfrith and many more, in the wooden church of St. Peter, which he had built at York. The baptism of Eadwine is claimed as the work of a British missionary, Run, the son of Urbgen (Nennius, p. 54; *Annales Cambrenses*, p. 832), and it is also said that Eadwine, when he fled from Deira, found his first shelter with Cadvan, king of Gwynedd, and was brought up as a christian at his court. The suggestion that Run and Paulinus were the same (Stevenson) cannot be admitted, and though it is not improbable that Eadwine did flee to the Welsh king, the story of his baptism by a Welsh bishop must be rejected in the face of Bæda's narrative (*Ecclesiastical Documents*, i. 124, iii. 75). After his baptism he appointed York as the episcopal see of Paulinus, and began to build a larger church of stone. This church, which was square, or rather oblong, and of the basilican type, with rows of columns, contained the original wooden church, which was kept as an oratory within it (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. c. 14; Alcuin, *Carmen de Pontificibus*, v. 220). Eadwine was earnest in the work of conversion; he induced Eorpwald of East Anglia to accept christianity with all his kingdom, and the Northumbrian king and his queen were with Paulinus when, for thirty-six days, the bishop taught a great multitude near the Cheviots, and baptised them in the Glen, and again when he baptised a large number in the Trent. Accordingly christianity made great progress in Deira, where the king's influence was strong, while in Bernicia no churches were built. Throughout all Eadwine's empire there was at this time such peace and order that it was said that a woman might walk through the land alone with her new-born child, from sea to sea, and none would do her harm. And the king cared for the comfort of his people, for he made drinking-fountains alongside the high-roads, and by each set up a stake to which a brazen cup was hung, and whether for fear or for love of him no one carried off these cups. He proclaimed the excellence of his kingdom by the state he kept, for when he rode with his thegns from place to place banners of purple and gold were carried before him, and even when he walked along the streets of a town a standard called 'tuuf,' a tuft of feathers on a spear, went before him. His greatness was a menace to the rising power of Mercia, and its heathen king, Penda, who had already routed the West-Saxons, made alliance with Cædwalla [q. v.], king of Gwynedd, and in 633 the allied armies of the Welsh and the Mercians marched against him. Eadwine advanced to meet them, and gave them battle on 12 Oct. at Heathfield, probably Hatfield Chase, near Doncaster. His army was totally routed, and he and his eldest son, Osfrith, were slain. Eadwine's head was taken to York and buried in the church of St. Peter that he had begun, in the porch of St. Gregory; his body was buried in the monastery of Whitby (*Hist. Eccles.* ii. 20, iii. 24). He was forty-eight at the time of his death. The battle of Heathfield broke up Eadwine's kingdom into its two component parts, for Osric, a cousin of Eadwine, succeeded him in Deira, while the Bernicians chose a king of their own royal house, Eanfrith, the son of Æthelfrith. It also overthrew christianity in the north, for both Osric and Eanfrith, though they had been baptised, turned back to paganism. Shortly before Eadwine's death he sent to Pope Honorius requesting that he would grant Paulinus the pall. The pope's answer and the pall did not arrive until after the king had fallen. Paulinus fled from Northumbria, and with the queen and her two children and Iffi, the son of Osfrith, sought shelter in Kent. Eadfrith, Eadwine's younger son by his first wife, Coenburh, fled to his father's victor, Penda, probably to escape from Osric, and was treacherously slain by his host. Of Eadwine's children by Æthelburh, a son, Æthelhun, and a daughter, Ætheldryth, died young, and were buried at York; another son, Vuscfrea, and a daughter, Eanflæd, were taken by their mother to the court of their uncle Eadbald. Vuscfrea was sent to be educated at the court of Dagobert, and died there, and Eanflæd [q. v.] became the wife of the Northumbrian king, Oswiu. Eadwine obtained a place in the calendar, and an account is given of him in the 'Nova Legenda,' p. 116: 4 Oct. is the day of St. Edwin, king and martyr (*Acta SS.*, Bolland, Oct. vi. 108).

[Bædæ Hist. Eccles. and Nennius, Hist. Brit. (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Anglo-Saxon Chron. and Annales Cambrenses, Mon. Hist. Brit.; Alcuin, Carmen de Pontificibus, Historians of York, i. (Rolls Ser.); Haddan and Stubbs's Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents; Green's Making of England; Raine's Fasti Eboracenses.] W. H.

EDWIN, ELIZABETH REBECCA (1771?–1854), actress, was the daughter of an actor named Richards, who, with his wife, was engaged at the Crow Street Theatre,

Dublin. At this house, when eight years old, she appeared in Prince Arthur and other juvenile characters, including a part written specially for her by O'Keefe in his lost and forgotten farce, 'The Female Club.' She also, for her benefit, played Priscilla Tomboy in 'The Romp,' an abridged version of Bickerstaffe's 'Love in the City.' She left the stage for a time to be educated. After playing in the country she appeared at Covent Garden 13 Nov. 1789, as Miss Richards from Margate, in 'The Citizen' of Murphy. The following year she joined at Hull the company of Tate Wilkinson, playing with great success in comedy. In the line of parts taken by Mrs. Jordan, Wilkinson declares her the 'very best' he has seen, surpassing her predecessor in youth and grace. 'Her face,' he says, 'is more than pretty, it is handsome and strong featured, not unlike Bellamy's; her person is rather short, but take her altogether she is a nice little woman' (*Wandering Patentee*, iii. 127). She married John Edwin the younger [q. v.] in 1791, and she joined with her husband the mixed company of actors and amateurs assembled by the Earl of Barrymore at Wargrave. She appeared with her husband at the Haymarket, 20 June 1792, as Lucy in 'An Old Man taught Wisdom.' Subsequently she passed to the private theatre in Fishamble Street, Dublin, opened by Lord Westmeath and Frederick Jones. In October 1794 she had rejoined Tate Wilkinson, appearing in Doncaster with her husband. With him she visited Cheltenham, and 14 Oct. 1797, still in his company, made, as Mrs. Edwin from Dublin, her first appearance in Bath, playing Amanthis and Roxalana. Here, in Bristol, or in Southampton, where she became a special favourite, she took the leading characters in comedy and farce. In 1805, while in Dublin, she lost her husband. At the recommendation of T. Sheridan she was engaged for Drury Lane. Before she reached the theatre, however, it was burnt down, and on 14 Oct. 1809, as Widow Cheerly in 'The Soldier's Daughter,' she appeared with the Drury Lane company at the Lyceum. The chief characters in comedy were at once assigned her, and 3 Feb. 1810 she was the original Lady Traffic in 'Riches, or the Wife and Brother,' extracted by Sir James Bland Burgess from Massinger's 'City Madam.' At Drury Lane she remained for some years. She was selected to recite, 3 July 1815, the verses of the manager Arnold in commemoration of Waterloo. She then returned to Dublin, to Crow Street Theatre, and, engaged by R. W. Elliston [q. v.], appeared, 16 Nov. 1818, at the Olympic, speaking an opening address by Moncrieff. The following year she accompanied her manager to Drury Lane. Mrs. Edwin was also seen at the Haymarket, the Adelphi, the Surrey, and other London theatres, and played at Scarborough, Weymouth, Cheltenham, &c. At a comparatively early age she retired from the stage with a competency. This was greatly diminished by the dishonesty of a stockbroker, whom she entrusted with money for the purchase of an annuity, and who absconded to America with between eight and nine thousand pounds. This compelled her to return again to the boards. On 13 March 1821 she played at Drury Lane the Duenna in Sheridan's comic opera, this being announced as her first appearance in a character of that description. With rare candour she owned herself too old for the part in which she was accustomed to appear. She appeared at Drury Lane the following season. For very many years she lived in retirement, and, all but forgotten, died at her lodgings in Chelsea 3 Aug. 1854. Mrs. Edwin was a pleasing comedian, in the line of Mrs. Jordan, who behaved with consideration to her, and whose equal she never was. In 'Histrionic Epistles,' 12mo, 1807, attributed to John Wilson Croker [q.v.], she is the subject of a severe attack. She had the reputation of delivering an address or epilogue with especial grace and fervour. She was below the middle height, fair, and with expressive features. Careful in money matters she barely escaped the charge of parsimoniousness. Portraits of her by De Wilde as Eliza in 'Riches' and Albina Mandeville in 'The Will' are in the Mathews collection at the Garrick Club. A painting of her, formerly at Evans's supper rooms, is in the possession of Mr. J. C. Parkinson. The reticence concerning her christian name uniform among writers on the stage is broken by the author of 'Leaves from a Manager's Note-book' in the 'New Monthly Magazine,' who speaks of her as Elizabeth Rebecca.

[Genest's Account of the English Stage; Monthly Mirror, February and March 1810; Tate Wilkinson's Wandering Patentee, 1795; Mrs. C. Baron Wilson's Our Actresses, 1845; Williams's Dramatic Censor for 1811; Era newspaper, 13 Aug. 1854.] J. K.

EDWIN, Sir HUMPHREY (1642–1707), lord mayor of London, descended from the ancient family of Edwin of Herefordshire, was born at Hereford in 1642. He was the only son of William Edwin, twice mayor of Hereford, by his wife, Anne, of the family of Mansfield. Of his two sisters, Mary, the younger, became the wife of Sir Edward Dering, who in 1701 wrote a curious book bewailing her death entitled 'The most excellent Maria, in a brief character of her

incomparable virtues and goodness.' Edwin came to London, and in or before 1670 married Elizabeth, the daughter of Samuel Sambrooke, a wealthy London merchant of the ward of Bassishaw, and sister of Sir Jeremy Sambrooke. He began business as a merchant in Great St. Helen's, and here his four eldest children were born—Samuel, baptised 12 March 1671; Humphrey, 24 Feb. 1673; Thomas, 4 July 1676; and Charles, 7 Feb. 1677 (St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, Reg. of Baptisms). He afterwards appears to have removed to the neighbouring parish of St. Peter-le-Poor, where his son Samuel was living at the time of his marriage in September 1697 (Chester, *Marriage Licenses*, ed. Foster, col. 444). His marriage and success in trade (probably as a wool merchant) brought him great wealth. In 1678 he was admitted a freeman of the Barber-Surgeons' Company by redemption, becoming afterwards an assistant of the company, and master in 1688. In 1694, however, he was dismissed from the office of assistant for his continued non-attendance at the court meetings. He afterwards became a member of the company of Skinners. Edwin was a nonconformist, and very firm in his opinions. This seems to have brought him under the notice of James II, who was anxious to conciliate the dissenters, in order to obtain their help in relaxing the penal laws against the Roman catholics. On 11 Oct. 1687 he was sworn in as alderman of Tower ward, on the direct appointment of the king, in the place of Sir John Chapman, discharged by the royal mandate. On the 18th of the following month the king knighted him at Whitehall, and a few weeks later appointed him sheriff of Glamorganshire for the ensuing year (*London Gazette*, No. 2308). It was probably before this that he purchased the considerable estate and mansion of Llanmihangel Plas in Glamorganshire, from Sir Robert Thomas, bart., the last of a long line of manorial lords of that name (Nicholas, *Hist. of Glamorganshire*, 1874, p. 125).

In August 1688 Edwin was chosen sheriff of London and Middlesex, entering upon his duties on 11 Oct. following. The year was an eventful one. In December Edwin, with his colleague and the aldermen of London, attended the Prince of Orange on his entry into London, and took part in February in the proclamation of the king and queen in Cheapside and at the Royal Exchange. On 25 Oct. Edwin was elected alderman of the ward of Cheap, in succession to William Kiffen, the baptist minister [q. v.], who suffered notorious persecution from James II, but he again removed, 22 Oct. 1689, to Tower ward, which he continued to represent until his death. He and six others were appointed by the king, in April 1689, commissioners of excise, but in the following September all were dismissed excepting Edwin and Sir Henry Ashurst, and other wealthy citizens were appointed in their room. Edwin continued to hold the office, to which a salary of 1,000*l.* was attached, until April 1691. Edwin took a prominent part in the military affairs of the city. Besides being an officer of the Artillery Company, he became captain of the regiment of horse volunteers, a corps of four hundred citizens, established in July 1689 and maintained at their own expense, with the king as their colonel and the Earl of Monmouth as lieutenant-colonel. He was also colonel of a regiment of the trained bands; but in March 1690, on the churchmen becoming a majority in the court of lieutenancy, Edwin and five other aldermen who held nonconformist opinions, were turned out, and five others belonging to the church party chosen in their places. In the following year Edwin was the victim of a malicious prosecution conducted by Sir Bartholomew Shower, afterwards recorder of London. He was indicted for perjury, and a true bill found against him in November 1691 by the grand jury of Ossulston hundred in Middlesex; but upon his trial in the following February he was acquitted. In a contemporary pamphlet the prosecution is described as 'so unjust that the L. C. J. Holt, seeing it proceeded from the depth of malice, would not suffer Sir Humphry to swear all his witnesses, there being no need of any further proofs at his trial' (*A Letter to an honest citizen conc. the election of a Recorder for the City of London*, by T. S., 1692, Guildhall Library, Tracts, vol. cciii. No. 24). From two treasury minutes dated 5 July 1694 and 20 Oct. 1696, Edwin appears to have owned extensive property in Westminster, adjoining Westminster Hall and the clock house (*Cal. of Treas. Papers*, 1557–1696, pp. 377, 554). He also had a town house at Kensington (Hatton, *New View of London*, i. 33), and added to his Glamorganshire property by the possession of the castle and lordship of Ogmore, the lease of which was renewed to him in 1702 (*Notes and Queries*, 6th ser. xi. 486). In September 1697 Samuel, the eldest son of Sir Humphrey, was married to Lady Catherine Montague, daughter of the Earl of Manchester, and on the 30th of the same month Edwin was elected lord mayor, the customary mayoralty pageant being omitted, owing doubtless to his religious principles (Fairholt, *Lord Mayors' Pageants*, Percy Soc. vol. x. pt. ii. pp. 283–4). Shortly after his accession to

office (6 Nov. 1697) William III, who returned home after the treaty of Ryswick, made a magnificent public entry into London. The reception was the grandest spectacle witnessed in the city since the Restoration.

Soon after his election Edwin gave great offence by attending a nonconformist worship on the afternoons of Sunday, 31 Oct. and 7 Nov., in full civic state. A meeting of the court of aldermen was held on Tuesday, 9 Nov., to consider a complaint of the sword-bearer against the lord mayor for compelling his attendance on the occasion, when the lord mayor was deserted by all his officers except the sword-bearer, who was locked in a pew (LUTTRELL, iv. 303). According to the official minute, the court took notice that the lord mayor had 'for two Lords dayes past in the afternoones gone to private meetings with the Sword.' His lordship promised to forbear the practice for the future, and it was ordered 'that the like practice shall not be used for the time to come' (*City Records*, Rep. 102, fol. 11). A letter written 11 Nov. states that the meeting-house attended by the lord mayor was More's. Wilson and others state that it was Pinners' Hall; a contemporary skit, 'A Dialogue between Jack and Will,' describes it as Salters' Hall. Burnet says that the bill for preventing occasional conformity had its origin in Edwin's state visit to Pinners' Hall (*Hist.* v. 49).

Edwin's unwise action roused all the bitterness of the high church party and caused an angry literary controversy. Dr. Nicholls led the attack in his 'Apparat. ad Def. Eccles. Angl.,' and was answered by James Peirce (*Vindication of the Dissenters*, pt. i. p. 276) and by Calamy (*Abridgment*, i. 561). A young clergyman named Edward Oliver, preaching before Edwin in St. Paul's Cathedral towards the close of his mayoralty (22 Oct. 1698), had the bad taste to declaim against the nonconformist mode of worship. The sermon soon appeared in print and was answered by a pamphlet, of which two editions were published, entitled 'A Rowland for an Oliver, or a Sharp Rebuke for a Saucy Levite. . . . By a Lover of Unity.' Edwin had also to face the ridicule of the stage and the lampoons of the wits of the day. The two following brochures are preserved in the Guildhall Library: 'A Dialogue betwixt Jack and Will concerning the Lord Mayor's going to Meeting-house,' with the Sword carried before him,' London, 1697, 4to, and 'The Puritanical Justice, or the Beggars turn'd Thieves,' London, 1698, 4to.

Penkethman, in his comedy of 'Love without Interest,' 1699, has the following allusion: 'If you'll compound for a catch, I'll sing you one of my Lord Mayor's going to Pin-makers Hall to hear a sniveling non-conseparatist divine divide and subdivide into the two and thirty points of the compass.' Swift, in his 'Tale of a Tub,' by way of satirising the toleration of dissenters, states that Jack's tatters are coming into fashion both in court and city, and describes Edwin under the name of Jack getting upon a great horse and eating custard. A satiric print illustrating the text is given in the fifth edition of the 'Tale of a Tub' (sect. xi. p. 233); this is somewhat altered in later editions; the scene is Ludgate Hill, showing the gate, with St. Paul's in the background. De Foe wrote a pamphlet bearing the title 'An Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters in Cases of Preferment; with a Preface to the Lord Mayor, occasioned by his carrying the Sword to a Conventicle,' London, 1697.

The remainder of Edwin's mayoralty passed off without event and apparently with credit to himself. Many corporate offices fell vacant during the year, by which he received the large sum of 4,000*l.* Towards the end of May he temporarily retired through illness, with the king's leave, to his house at Kensington, Sir Robert Clayton filling his place in his absence (LUTTRELL, iv. 386).

Edwin died on 14 Dec. 1707 at his seat in Llanmihangel, where a monument to his memory remains in the parish church. His widow died in London on 22 Nov. 1714, and was subsequently buried beside him at Llanmihangel. He left no will, but administration was granted to his son Charles on 19 Feb. 1707–8. Towards the erection of the London workhouse, which was begun in his mayoralty, he gave 100*l.* and a pack of wool. Besides the children already mentioned Edwin had four daughters and a fifth son, John, from whom is descended the present Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.

[Memoir of the family of Edwin, by J. Edwin-Cole, in Nichols's Herald and Genealogist, vi. 54–62; Wilson's Life of De Foe, i. 270–4; Duncumb's Herefordshire; Luttrell's Relation; Extracts from the Barber-Surgeons' Company's Records, furnished by Mr. Sydney Young; Notes and Queries, 2nd ser. iv. 389; Chetham Society's publications, xxi. 248.] C. W–H.

EDWIN, JOHN, the elder (1749–1790), comedian, born 10 Aug. 1749 in Clare Street, St. Clement Danes, was the only son of John Edwin, a watchmaker, by Hannah, daughter of Henry Brogden, a statuary in York. He had two sisters, Mary and Elizabeth. He was sent at nine years of age to a farmhouse near Enfield, and obtained a moderate education, including a good knowledge of music.

Before, at the age of fifteen, he left school to fill a post at the pension office of the exchequer, he had acted with some amateur associates in a stable. He joined in 1764 a 'spouting club' meeting at the French Horn tavern in Wood Street, Cheapside, and made the acquaintance of William Woodfall, whose representation of Old Mask in Colman's 'Musical Lady' induced him to become an actor. His first essay was made at an amateur performance at the Falcon tavern in Fetter Lane. He became known to Shuter, who predicted his future success, and to Lee of Drury Lane Theatre, who engaged him at a salary of a guinea a week for a summer season in Manchester. Before leaving London Edwin played at the Haymarket at a benefit performance Quidnunc in Murphy's farce 'The Upholsterer.' A distant relative named John Edwin of George Street, Hanover Square, died, leaving to charities a fortune of near 50,000*l.* Mr. Way, a sub-governor of the South Sea House, and one of twelve executors to the will, appointed Edwin secretary to the trust, with a salary of 30*l.* This post Edwin held a year. Way appears also to have given him 500*l.* for the purpose of his entry as accountant into the South Sea House. In 1765, on starting for Manchester, Edwin made over this sum to his father. In Manchester he played characters belonging to Shuter, whom he was accustomed to mimic. In the autumn Edwin went to Dublin, appearing for the first time at the Smock Alley Theatre as Sir Philip Modelove in Mrs. Centlivre's 'A Bold Stroke for a Wife.' His other parts included Lord Trinket in the 'Jealous Wife.' When as Lord Trinket he had to speak the words, 'I cut a mighty ridiculous figure here,' a reply was received from the audience, 'You do indeed.' Things theatrical in Dublin were at the lowest ebb. Edwin's salary was rarely paid in full, and after a vagabond life in Ireland he ran away from his engagement and returned to England. After various adventures in country towns he appeared at the Bath theatre on 7 Oct. 1768 as Periwinkle in Mrs. Centlivre's 'Bold Stroke for a Wife.' Here he formed a connection with Mrs. Walmsley, a milliner in Horse Street, the subsequent abandonment of which, after twenty years' continuance, caused him to be occasionally hissed from the stage. To this connection was due the birth of his son, John Edwin [q. v.] The connection with the Bath theatre, at which he became a favourite, was maintained during many years. Among the characters in which he was seen were Dogberry, First Gravedigger, Launcelot Gobbo, Sir Hugh Evans, Mawworm in 'The Hypocrite,' and Sir Anthony Absolute. His first appearance at the Haymarket took place on 19 June 1776 as Flaw in Foote's comedy 'The Cozeners.' His first reception was but moderately favourable, and though as Billy Button in Foote's 'Maid of Bath' he established his reputation, Foote gave him comparatively few opportunities. Edwin did not appear in London until his great model, Shuter, had disappeared from the stage. George Colman, on whom the management of the Haymarket devolved in 1777, allowed Edwin to play characters such as Hardcastle in 'She stoops to conquer,' Launcelot Gobbo, Justice Woodcock, and he 'created' the part of Lazarillo (Figaro) in the 'Spanish Barber.' From this period Edwin was a mainstay of the Haymarket, which was only allowed to be open during the summer. In the seasons of 1776–7, 1777–8, and 1778–9 he reappeared in Bath. On 24 Sept. 1779, as Touchstone in 'As you like it,' and as Midas in the piece of that name, he made his first appearance at Covent Garden. His success at Bath as Punch in 'Pleasures of the Town,' a piece extracted from Fielding's 'Author's Farce,' was the cause of his engagement at Covent Garden, where, in 'The Mirror, or Harlequin Everywhere,' assigned to Dibdin, he 'created' the same character (Punch). Still appearing during the summer season at the Haymarket, Edwin played at Covent Garden from this date until his death in 1790. The list of his characters at one or other of these houses is inexhaustible. He 'created' very many parts in pieces now all but forgotten of Miles Peter Andrews, Mrs. Cowley, Pilon, Holcroft, &c., and played Cloten, Sir Andrew Aguecheek, Speed in 'Two Gentlemen of Verona,' Dromio of Syracuse, Ben in 'Love for Love,' and many other characters in works of established reputation. His association with O'Keeffe was eminently beneficial to both actor and dramatist. In a supplement to his 'Recollections' O'Keeffe supplies, in some doggerel verses, a list of two-and-twenty characters in pieces of his own in which Edwin had appeared. The comic songs, in the delivery of which Edwin obtained perhaps his highest popularity, and which were reprinted with the name of Edwin, were mostly written by O'Keeffe. In his 'Recollections' O'Keeffe bears frequent testimony to the merits of Edwin. A joke current at the time was that 'when Edwin died O'Keeffe would be damned.' Edwin's last appearance was at the Haymarket on 6 Aug. 1790 as Gregory Gubbins in the 'Battle of Hexham.' He died on 31 Oct. in the same year, and was buried on Sunday, 7 Nov., at 8 P.M., on the north side of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, be-

tween Dr. Arne and Edwin's great prototype Shuter. The pall-bearers were O'Keeffe, Shield the musician, Quick, 'Gentleman' Lewis, Holman, Wilson, Hull, and Johnstone. Edwin left a widow, Miss Mary Hubbard, whom he married on 13 June 1790 at St. John's Church, Westminster, and who, according to Reed's manuscript 'Notitia Dramatica,' died 8 Jan. 1794. Colman classes Edwin as the best burletta singer that ever had been, or perhaps will be, and adds that 'Nature in gifting him with the *vis comica* had dealt towards him differently from low comedians in general, for she had enabled him to look irresistibly funny, with a very agreeable, if not handsome, set of features, and while he sung in a style which produced roars of laughter, there was a melody in some of the upper tones of his voice that was beautiful' (Peake, *Memoirs of the Colman Family*, ii. 10–11). Reynolds, the dramatist, says that Edwin, disdaining buffoonery, 'established a sort of entre-nous-ship . . . with the audience, and made them his confidants' (*Life and Times*, 1826, ii. 61), and did it so neatly as 'frequently to enrich the business of the stage.' He says that he was present at a performance of the 'Son-in-Law,' when in the scene in which Cranky, objecting to Bowkitt as a son-in-law, observes, 'Besides, you are such an ugly fellow!' Edwin thereupon, as Bowkitt, came to the front of the stage, and pointing to Reynolds, said, 'Now I submit to the decision of an enlightened British public which is the ugliest fellow of the three—I, old Cranky, or that gentleman in the front row of the balcony box.' John Bernard (1756–1828) [q. v.], who claims to have supplied Anthony Pasquin with materials for his biography of Edwin, speaks repeatedly of Edwin, calling him the 'greatest genius' he 'ever encountered' (*Retrospections*, i. 186) and 'the most original actor . . . in the old world or the new' (*ib.* ii. 249). He says also that he wanted variety. Boaden, 'Life of Mrs. Siddons,' i. 117, also compares Edwin to Liston, and says that neither was fully enjoyed except in a small theatre. In his private life Edwin was a boon companion and a wag and the hero of many questionable adventures. In his 'Life of Bannister,' i. 247, Boaden says that he drank, and was 'the absolute victim of Scottish intemperance.' Edwin used to reach the theatre drunk at the bottom of a chaise. The clothes were thrust upon him and he was pushed on to the stage when he was able to collect himself, and 'his acting seemed only the richer for the bestial indulgence that had overwhelmed him.' His merits, which were high, fail to justify the system of gagging to which he resorted. Under his name were published: 1. 'The Last Legacy of John Edwin,' 1780, with portrait. 2. 'Edwin's Jests,' 12mo (no date). 3. 'Edwin's Pills to Purge Melancholy,' 2nd edition, with additions, 1788, 8vo. 4. 'Eccentricities arranged and digested by John Williams, *alias* Anthony Pasquin,' 1798, 2 vols. 8vo. This work has at least three different title-pages. In these volumes nothing seems to be his. The 'Eccentricities' contains the particulars of his life, told with insolent amplitude and comment by Williams. From this book subsequent biographers have taken all that is preserved. The Mathews collection of portraits in the Garrick Club contains pictures of Edwin as Peeping Tom and as Justice Woodcock, by Beach, one by Gainsborough (?), an early work, and one by Edridge.

[Genest's Account of the English Stage. In addition to the Eccentricities of Edwin by Williams, of which the first volume is partly occupied by his life and the second by the adventures, jests, and sayings fastened upon him, the theatrical biographers of Boaden, of Kemble, Mrs. Inchbald, Mrs. Jordan, and Bannister supply most particulars. The Oracle, a periodical issued by Boaden about 1790, has been seen by Genest. Not being in the British Museum it is now inaccessible.] J. K.

EDWIN, JOHN, the younger (1768–1805), actor, son of John Edwin [q. v.], is first heard of in 1777, when his father, applying to George Colman for an advance of salary, offers to throw in Mrs. Edwin and Jack. The following year, 30 July 1778, young Edwin appeared at the Haymarket as Hengo in a revival of 'Bonduca' by Beaumont and Fletcher. From this period, at the Haymarket or at Bath, he frequently played with his father, his first recorded appearance in a manly part being at Covent Garden, 26 March 1788, as Dick in 'The Apprentice' of Murphy for his father's benefit. Taken up by Lord Barrymore, who made an inseparable companion of him, he directed during some years the amateur theatricals at Wargrave, Berkshire, the seat of that nobleman. After his marriage to Miss Richards in 1791 he took Mrs. Edwin [q. v.] to Wargrave, where she overstayed the limits allowed her by her manager, Tate Wilkinson, of the York circuit, with whom in consequence she quarrelled. With his wife Edwin went to the Haymarket, appearing 20 June 1792 in 'The Virgin Unmasked,' previously known as 'An Old Man taught Wisdom,' a ballad farce of Fielding, in which he played Blister to the Lucy of Mrs. Edwin. He accompanied his wife to Dublin and to Doncaster in 1794, and on most of her country tours, and died in Dublin, 22 Feb. 1805, a victim to degrading dissipation. Edwin

was best known at Bath, where he was held in some parts equal or superior to his father. He was an excellent country actor, and would probably, but for his irregular life, have made a high reputation. Tate Wilkinson praises his Lenitive in 'The Prize' and his Nipperkin in 'The Sprigs of Laurel,' and says that as Mr. Tag in 'The Spoil'd Child' he is better than any comedian he (Wilkinson) has hitherto seen. He adds that 'Mr. Edwin dresses his characters better and more characteristic than any comic actor I recollect on the York stage' (*Wandering Patentee*, iv. 204). A tombstone to his memory, erected by his wife in St. Werburgh's churchyard, Dublin, attributes his death to the acuteness of his sensibility. In a satirical poem, attributed to John Wilson Croker [q. v.], had appeared some stinging lines upon Edwin, the 'lubbard spouse' of Mrs. Edwin, and the degenerate son of a man 'high on the rolls of comic fame.' Upon reading these Edwin, it is said, wrote to a friend: 'Come and help me to destroy myself with some of the most splendid cogniac [*sic*] that I have ever exported to cheer a breaking heart.' From the debauch then begun Edwin did not recover, and he died uttering fearful imprecations upon his then unknown satirist.

[Genest's Account of the English Stage; Monthly Mirror, February and March 1810; Mrs. C. Baron Wilson's Our Actresses, 1844; Tate Wilkinson's Wandering Patentee; Thespian Dict. 1805.] J. K.

EDWY or EADWIG (*d.* 959), king of the English, the eldest son of Eadmund and St. Ælfgifu, could scarcely have been more than fifteen when he succeeded to the throne on the death of his uncle Eadred [q. v.] in 955. He was remarkably beautiful, and was called the 'Handsome' (Pancali) by his people (Æthelweard, 520). His accession was followed by the downfall of the party that had been in power during the last reign, and Eadgifu, his grandmother, was despoiled of all her possessions. At his coronation, which took place at Kingston in January 956, he left the banquet for the society of two ladies, Æthelgifu, who was, it has been suggested, his foster mother (Robertson), and her daughter Ælfgifu [q. v.], whom Æthelgifu wished him to marry. This marriage would have been uncanonical, and Dunstan and Bishop Cynesige forced him to return to the hall [see under Dunstan and Ælfgifu]. At the instigation of Æthelgifu he drove Dunstan into exile, and either in 956 or 957 married Ælfgifu (*Chron. de Abingdon*, i. 218; Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 1201). The government was carried on foolishly, and the people of the northern part of the kingdom considered that they were treated unjustly. The power had passed into the hands of the nobles of Wessex, and it is therefore likely that the Mercians and Northumbrians had cause to complain. In 957 they made an insurrection. Archbishop Oda, who disapproved of the marriage with Ælfgifu, and Eadgar, the king's younger brother, withdrew from the court, and Eadgar was chosen king by the northern people. Eadwig appears to have advanced to meet the insurgents, and to have retreated before them at Gloucester, where, according to a late story, Æthelgifu or Ælfgifu was taken and put to death (Osbern, Eadmer, *Vita Odonis*). A meeting of the 'witan' was held, in which the kingdom was divided between the brothers, and Eadwig was left only with the portion to the south of the Thames. In 958 Oda separated Eadwig and Ælfgifu, 'because they were too near akin' (*A.-S. Chron.*), and the archbishop returned to Eadwig's court (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 472). The West-Saxon nobles, and especially the members of the royal house, remained faithful to him. In the first year of his reign, possibly at his coronation (Stubbs), Eadwig had made grants to the monasteries of Wilton, Abingdon, and Worcester (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 436, 441, 451), and we may safely reject the story of Osbern that he engaged in a general persecution of the monks. Indeed, the revolt against him had nothing to do with the dispute between the seculars and regulars, which did not begin until the next reign. Nevertheless it seems probable that the party in power disliked and put a stop to the earlier reform of the monastic houses, which had been carried out by Dunstan with signal success at Glastonbury, and the king's personal quarrel with Dunstan must naturally have inclined him to look with disfavour on his work. Glastonbury was certainly seized, and the condition of Winchester when Æthelwold became bishop there seems to show that any reforms that had been carried out by Ælfheah were undone by his successor (Stubbs). There is also some reason to believe that Ælfsine and Brithelm, who were in turn appointed to the see of Canterbury by Eadwig, belonged to the West-Saxon and anti-Dunstanite party as regards both ecclesiastical and civil matters. Eadwig died on 1 Oct. 959, and was buried at Winchester. He left no children. He was probably beloved by the lower class in the south, for Henry of Huntingdon, whose chronicle often preserves popular traditions and sympathies, speaks well of him and laments his early death. Dunstan is said to have had a vision in which he saw the king's soul carried off by devils, and to have delivered him by his prayers.

[Anglo-Saxon Chron.; Florence of Worcester; Æthelweard, Mon. Hist. Brit.; Henry of Huntingdon (Rolls Ser.); Memorials of Dunstan (Rolls Ser.), see Introd. lxxxviii–xcvii; Vita Odonis, Anglia Sacra, ii.; William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum, c. 147, Gesta Pontificum, p. 147 (Rolls Ser.); Kemble's Codex Dipl. vol. ii.; Robertson's Historical Essays, 168, 180, 192; Hook's Archbishops of Canterbury, i. 375 sq.; Allen's Royal Prerogative, 220; Hallam's Middle Ages, ii. 264.] W. H.

EEDES, JOHN (1609?–1667?), divine, son of Nicholas Eedes, born at Salisbury, Wiltshire, was entered at Oriel College, Oxford, in 1626, and proceeded B.A. 3 June 1630. He afterwards 'became a minister in the isle of Shepie, whence being ejected in the time of the rebellion suffer'd much by imprisonment in Ely House, and other miseries' (Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* ed. Bliss, iii. 802). On his release he took the curacy of Broad Chalk, Wiltshire, which he held 'with much ado' for about two years, and was then made vicar of Hale, Hampshire. After the Restoration he continued at Hale, where he was murdered in his house by thieves in or about 1667, and was buried in the church. He published 'The Orthodox Doctrine concerning Justification by Faith asserted and vindicated, wherein the Book of Mr. William Eyre . . . is examined; and also the Doctrine of Mr. Baxter . . . discussed,' 4to, London, 1654. In dedicating it to his friend, Edward Dodington, Eedes states that he had written another and more elaborate treatise on justification, besides 'other things, both practical and polemical, which I have in readinesse for the presse.'

[Wood's Fasti Oxon. (Bliss), i. 453.] G. G.

EEDES, RICHARD (1555–1604), dean of Worcester. [See Edes.]

EEDES, RICHARD (*d.* 1686), presbyterian divine, born at Feckenham, Worcestershire, 'became either clerk or chorister' of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in 1626, graduated B.A. in February 1629, and took the curacy of Bishop's Cleeve, Gloucestershire, at Michaelmas 1632. He proceeded M.A. 17 March 1634. He continued at Bishop's Cleeve 'in good esteem for his conformity' until the civil war broke out, when he subscribed to the covenant. About 1647 he became vicar of Beckford, near Bishop's Cleeve, where he remained until 1658. By the persuasion of 'a parliament captain,' who had a farm in Bishop's Cleeve, he then returned to his old cure there in the hope of succeeding to the rectory. From his published sermons it is plainly evident that he had tired of presbyterianism and longed for the king's return. Immediately after the Restoration he delivered an ultra-loyal harangue on the text, 'As whatsoever the king did pleased all the people' (2 Sam. iii. 36), before the mayor and aldermen of Gloucester, but all his attempts to conciliate the court party proved unavailing. He remained at Bishop's Cleeve as minister until the Bartholomew Act of 1662, when 'he silenced himself,' but continued to attend the services of the church 'as much as his age would give him leave.' Some few years before his death he removed to Gretton, in the parish of Winchcomb, Gloucestershire, where he died in the beginning of April 1686, and was buried on the 6th in the middle of the north side of Bishop's Cleeve Church in the presence of 'a vast crowd of those who knew and loved him.'

Eedes was the author of: 1. 'Great Salvation by Jesus Christ,' a sermon (on Heb. ii. 3), 8vo, London, 1656. 2. 'Christ exalted and Wisdom justified; or, the Saints' Esteem of Jesus Christ, as most precious, handled; and their wise Choice and Subjection to Him as their Lord and Saviour vindicated,' 8vo, London, 1659, 'commended to the world,' says Wood, 'by the epistle of Mr. Rich. Baxter.' 3. 'Great Britain's Resurrection; or, England's Complacencie in her Royal Soveraign King Charles the Second. A sermon [on 2 Sam. iii. 36] preached in the Lecture at Gloucester, 5 June 1660,' 4to, London, 1660. 4. Sermon (on 1 Pet. ii. 7).

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), iv. 187–8; Wood's Fasti Oxon. (Bliss), i. 451, 474.] G. G.

EFFINGHAM, Earls of. [See Howard.]

EGAN, JAMES (1799–1842), mezzotint engraver, of humble origin, was born in the county of Roscommon in Ireland in 1799. He was employed by S. W. Reynolds [q. v.], the well-known mezzotint engraver, at first as little more than an errand-boy, but later in laying his mezzotint grounds; it was thus that Egan first learnt his art. Gaining much experience in this, he set up a business of ground-laying for engravers, while he studied assiduously in order to become an engraver himself. Having neither money, friends, nor previous education as an artist, he was compelled to rely solely on his own industry and ability, and suffered many privations. Unfortunately, just as he was about to gain some substantial reward for his efforts, consumptive symptoms began to manifest themselves, and after eight years' struggle with declining health Egan died at Pentonville, 2 Oct. 1842, aged 43. His best plate, and his last, executed under the most trying circumstances,

was 'English Hospitality in the Olden Time,' after G. Cattermole. Among his other engravings were 'Love's Reverie,' after J. R. Herbert, R.A., 'Abbot Boniface,' after C. S. Newton, R.A., 'The Morning after the Wreck,' after C. Bentley, 'The Study,' after E. Stone, 'The Mourner,' after J. M. Moore, 'The Young Wife,' 'The Citation of Wycliffe,' 'The Tribunal of the Inquisition,' and other pictures after S. J. E. Jones, and a portrait of John Lodge, librarian at Cambridge, after Walmisley. Egan, who married young, left a family, for whom a subscription was raised by his friends.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Ottley's Dict. of Recent and Living Artists; Andresen's Handbuch für Kupferstichsämmler; Art Union, 1842, p. 256.] L. C.

EGAN, JOHN (1750?–1810), chairman of Kilmainham, co. Dublin, was born about 1750 at Charleville, co. Cork, where his father was a beneficed clergyman, and having entered Trinity College, Dublin, as a sizar, he graduated there B.A. 1773, and LL.B. 1776; the degree of LL.D. was conferred upon him, *honoris causâ*, in 1790. He was called to the Irish bar in 1778, and, chiefly through the friendship of Lord Avonmore, chief baron of the exchequer, he made good way in his profession. In due course he received his silk gown; in 1787 he was elected a bencher of the Hon. Society of King's Inns, Dublin; and for several years before his death he held the judicial office of chairman of Kilmainham. For a considerable time he had been in the receipt of a very large share of business as a practising barrister, but his quarrel with Henry Grattan was professionally most injurious to him. In the Irish House of Commons he for some years represented the borough of Tallagh, co. Waterford, and his boldness as a member, especially on the question of the legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland, is well known to the student of Irish history. He died in 1810.

[Todd's Cat. of Dublin Graduates; Dublin Almanacs and Directories; Phillips's Curran and his Contemporaries.] B. H. B.

EGAN, PIERCE, the elder (1772–1849), author of 'Life in London,' is believed to have been born in London in 1772. From an early time he dwelt in the suburbs, and continued to reside there until his death, making frequent expeditions to every part of England where notable races, prize fights, matches, or amusements were expected to take place. By 1812 his reputation was established as 'reporter of sporting events' in the newspapers, and his *impromptu* epigrams, songs, and witticisms enjoyed a wide circulation. In that year, having secured a permanent engagement, which he held until the end of 1823, as the accredited purveyor of sporting news on a journal printed by E. Young, he married and settled, and his son, Pierce Egan the younger [q. v.], was born in 1814. In the same year he wrote and set in type and worked off with his own hands a book (pp. 144) concerning the Prince Regent and Miss Robinson, entitled 'The Mistress of Royalty; or the Loves of Florizel and Perdita, printed by and for Pierce Egan,' 1814. His declaration of authorship, signed and dated 25 Jan. 1843, is extant. In 1818 he wrote and published a serial work, monthly, called 'Boxiana; or Sketches of Modern Pugilism,' giving memoirs and portraits of all the most celebrated pugilists, contemporary and antecedent, with full reports of their respective prize fights, victories, and defeats, told with so much spirited humour, yet with such close attention to accuracy, that the work holds a unique position. It was continued in several volumes, with copperplates, to 1824. At this date, having seen that Londoners read with avidity his accounts of country sports and pastimes, he conceived the idea of a similar description of the amusements pursued by sporting men in town. Accordingly he announced the publication of 'Life in London' in shilling numbers, monthly, and secured the aid of George Cruikshank [q. v.] and his brother, Isaac Robert Cruikshank [q. v.], to draw and engrave the illustrations in aquatint, to be coloured by hand. George IV had caused Egan to be presented at court, and at once accepted the dedication of the forthcoming work. This was the more generous on the king's part because he must have known himself to have been often satirised and caricatured mercilessly in the 'Green Bag' literature by G. Cruikshank, the intended illustrator. On 15 July 1821 appeared the first number of 'Life in London; or, The Day and Night Scenes of Jerry Hawthorn, Esq., and his elegant friend, Corinthian Tom, accompanied by Bob Logic, the Oxonian, in their Rambles and Sprees through the Metropolis.' The success was instantaneous and unprecedented. 'It took both town and country by storm.' So great was the demand for copies, increasing with the publication of each successive number, month by month, that the colourists could not keep pace with the printers. The alternate scenes of high life and low life, the contrasted characters, and revelations of misery side by side with prodigal waste and folly, attracted attention, while the vivacity of dialogue and description never flagged.

Many years afterwards (in the 'Cornhill Magazine,' October 1860, No. viii. De Juventute in his 'Roundabout Papers') W. M. Thackeray described the impression left on him by his early perusal of the book, together with a much later reperusal and partial disenchantment, but did full justice to the clever illustrations which so largely contributed to the success of the work (see his paper on Cruikshank in the *Westminster Review*, 1840). Imitations and pirated copies appeared, both of the text and pictures. The chief of the former were 'Real Life in London; or, The Rambles and Adventures of Bob Tallyho, Esq., and his Cousin, the Hon. Tom Dashall, through the Metropolis. By an Amateur,' illustrated by W. Heath and H. Alken, Dighton, Brooke, Rowlandson, &c., May 1821, and following months to 1822, in sixpenny numbers. This was a favoured rival to 'Life in London,' and there was a suspicion that Egan was its author, but this is improbable. Other imitations were David Carey's 'Life in Paris, the Rambles of Dick Wildfire,' &c., illustrated by George Cruikshank,' 1821; 'The Sprees of Tom, Jerry, and Logick [*sic*];' 'A New Song of Flash, Fashion, Frolic, and Fun,' with general heading of 'Life in London,' and clumsy woodcut copies of groups after Cruikshank. The latter was published and signed by James Catnach, in Seven Dials, 23 March 1822, price twopence. Innumerable pictures appeared, representing the characters and incidents; print publishers made their market of the excitement, and the streets at night were certainly not quieter or 'sporting cribs' less frequented when fashion adopted 'Tom and Jerry' habits. At many of the playhouses dramatic versions increased the notoriety. First of these was Mr. W. Barrymore's play, produced at the Royal Amphitheatre on Monday, 17 Sept. 1821; Gomersal acted Corinthian Tom, Jones and Herring took Jerry Hawthorn and Bob Logic. At the Olympic, an extravaganza called 'Life in London,' by Charles I. M. Dibdin the younger [see under Dibdin, Charles], was produced on 12 Nov. 1821, with Baker, Oxberry, and Sam Vale as Tom, Jerry, and Logic. W. T. Moncrieff (supposed pseudonym of W. J. Thoms) wrote the dramatic version for the Adelphi, 'Tom and Jerry; or, Life in London,' with many songs and glees, costume and scenery superintended by Robert Cruikshank. Produced on Monday, 26 Nov. 1821, it had a great 'run,' with Wrench, W. Burroughs, and Wilkinson as Tom, Jerry, and Logic, Walbourn and Sanders for Dusty Bob and Black Sal, Mrs. Baker and Mrs. Waylett as Corinthian Kate and Sue. This version was adopted throughout the country and in the United States, everywhere securing crowded houses. Tom Dibdin [q. v.], Farrel, and Douglas Jerrold separately dramatised it during 1821 and 1822. For Egerton, Egan himself prepared a dramatic version produced at Sadler's Wells on Monday, 8 April 1822, with Elliott, Bob Keeley, and Vale as Tom, Jerry, and Logic. In this version, intended for Covent Garden, in December 1821, Egan had planned to marry Hawthorn and Mary Rosebud, when 'Jerry sees his folly, acknowledges his error, with Hawthorn Hill in perspective,' and concludes with 'Tom and Corinthian Kate made happy.' Postponed for six months and transferred to Sadler's Wells it was performed 191 nights. The book was translated at Paris by M. S—— in 1822. At this date (1822) Egan lived at Spann's Buildings, St. Pancras. At Paris the French translation was entitled 'The English Diorama; or, Picturesque Rambles in London,' 1822. On 2 June, at the Coburg Theatre, was produced T. Greenwood's 'Death of Life in London; or, Tom and Jerry's Funeral.'

In 1828 Egan, rebuking the pirates and plagiarists, produced his 'Finish to the Adventures of Tom, Jerry, and Logic, in their Pursuits through Life in and out of London, with numerous coloured illustrations by Robert Cruikshank' (n. d.) In this he introduced far more of the country sports and misadventures, anticipating, and no doubt suggesting, much of the character of Dickens's 'Pickwick Papers,' which were soon to follow and to excel it. He felt bound to display the consequences of such reckless prodigality and riot, by now introducing more serious incidents: the inconstancy, degradation, and suicide of Kate, the misery and deathbed of Logic, the sufferings as a convict of 'splendid Jem,' the sickness and remorse of Jerry, who reforms, retreats to the country, marries Mary Rosebud, his early sweetheart, and developes into a generous landlord and justice of peace; with the death of Corinthian Tom, who breaks his neck at a steeplechase. Strangely enough this concluding portion of the work remained wholly unknown to, or forgotten by, Thackeray, who writes of it as though merely suggested and never executed. It was reissued in 1871 by John Camden Hotten, with the original thirty-six aquatint plates. Possessing less of 'rattling gaiety' there is plenty of incident and more literary polish than in the antecedent 'Life.' Egan spent most of his time between the publication of these two books in varied literary work. He reported and published a full 'Account of the Trial of John Thurtell and Joseph Hunt' for the murder of William Weare. 'With an appendix disclosing some extraordinary facts,

exclusively in the possession of the editor,' 1824. It was certified as a fact that Thurtell seven hours before his execution had said: 'It is perhaps wrong in my situation, but I own I should like to read Pierce Egan's account of the great fight yesterday,' meaning one between Tom Spring and Langan. Egan was present at the Old Bailey sessions on 30 Oct. 1824, at the trial of Henry Fauntleroy [q. v.] for forgery, and published a full report. In 1822 he had issued 'The Life and Extraordinary Adventures of S. D. Hayward, denominated the Modern Macheath,' a highwayman condemned to death and executed 25 Nov. 1821. In 1821 Egan wrote a humorous account of a trial in the court of common pleas, 23 April, entitled 'The Fancy Tog's Man *versus* Young Sadboy the Milling Quaker.' Mr. Gore was the tailor, Edmund Foster pleading to be a minor, the defendant. Egan furnished the 'slang phrases' to Francis Grose's 'Dictionary of the Vulgar Tongue,' 1823. On Sunday, 1 Feb. 1824, with motto of 'Our king and country,' he commenced editing 'Pierce Egan's Life in London and Sporting Guide,' a weekly newspaper, price 8½*d.*, afterwards merging into 'Bell's Life in London.' His portrait, drawn by George Sharpless, engraved by Charles Turner, was published 'at Pierce Egan's tiny crib in Chancery Lane,' 1824. He published in the same year his more ambitious work, well illustrated by Theodore Lane, and dedicated to Edmund Kean, 'The Life of an Actor;' the hero, Peregrine Proteus, ending with a successful performance before royalty, after all the vicissitudes of provincial engagements and poverty. This work was popular, and, commencing in January 1824, was completed in 1825. In 1827 appeared Egan's 'Anecdotes, Original and Selected, of the Turf, the Chase, the Ring, and the Stage, embellished with thirteen coloured plates by Theodore Lane.' His 'Walks through Bath,' and his 'Trip to Ascot Races,' 1828, preceded the issue of his poem entitled 'The Show Folks,' embellished with nine designs on wood by the late Theodore Lane, engraved by John Thompson, 1831, accompanied by an interesting memoir of Lane [q. v.], who had died 28 May 1828. This book was written by Egan to benefit Lane's widow and children. His 'Life of an Actor' had been planned to benefit Lane in 1824. In 1831 he published 'Matthews's Comic Annual; or, The Snuff-Box and the Leetel Bird: an original humourous poem by Pierce Egan.' His important work, 'Pierce Egan's Book of Sports and Mirror of Life,' was completed, after serial publication, in 1832, and is a worthy companion of Hone's 'Every Day Book,' and the best work of its class, fully illustrated on every variety of country sports and pastimes, invaluable for reference. Egan's next work was a serial dedicated by express permission to the young Queen Victoria, and completed on New Year's day 1838, entitled 'The Pilgrims of the Thames in Search of the National.' This undertaking introduced to a wider public the artistic merits of his son Pierce, who designed and etched the numerous illustrations of 'Greenwich Park,' 'Richardson's Show,' 'Hampton Races,' 'The Match Girl,' 'The River,' 'Windsor,' 'Vauxhall,' 'Gravesend,' 'Source of the Thames,' 'The Nore Light,' 'Lord Mayor's Show,' &c. Egan's later years were spent in peaceful retirement. The editor of 'Bell's Life in London' wrote: 'Pierce was, with all his oddities, a right-minded fellow, and was respected by all to whom he was known.' Among his numerous fugitive works were 'fancy ditties' of every description, mirthful and serious, but never offensive; also guide-books to Dublin, Liverpool, &c., for he knew every spot in Great Britain. 'The veteran historian of the ring and sporting journalist' died on Friday, 3 Aug. 1849, at his house in Pentonville, London, 'aged 77 years,' leaving a large family behind him, 'most of whom are able to take care of themselves' (*Bell's Life*).

[Works cited throughout; John Camden Hotten's Preface to his edition of Life in London, 1870; Charles Hindley's Life and Times of James Catnach, 1878; European Magazine, November 1821; Gent. Mag. new ser. xxxii. 548; Bell's Life in London, 12 Aug. 1849, &c.] J. W. E.

EGAN, PIERCE, the younger (1814–1880), novelist, son of Pierce Egan [q. v.], the author of 'Life in London,' and associated with him in several of his works, was born in London in 1814, and early showed a taste for drawing. He was educated to follow art professionally, became a close frequenter of theatres, and made sketches during the performances, afterwards etching these designs, which were published as frontispieces to the plays in Davidge's 'Acting Drama.' His most ambitious work as an artist was a series of etchings to illustrate his father's serial, 'The Pilgrims of the Thames in Search of the National,' 1837. These were so successful and promising that he might have taken a fair position as an illustrator, and been well remunerated, but he preferred novel writing. His novels secured a ready sale; being first issued in weekly numbers, and afterwards in volumes. Several of them contained woodcuts and etchings by the author. Among these were 'Wat Tyler,' in 3 books, 1841, republished in 1851, full of ghastly incidents

of slaughter, with love scenes; 'Robin Hood;' 'Adam Bell, Clym o' the Cleugh, and William of Cloudeslie,' a long story of woodland adventures, 1842, with one of Egan's best etchings; 'Paul Jones,' the privateer, 2 vols., with Egan's etched frontispiece and designs on wood, 1842. Other early works were, 'The London Apprentice, and the Goldsmith's Daughter of East Chepe;' 'Edward the Black Prince; or, Feudal Days;' and 'Clifton Grey; or, Love and War,' a tale of the Crimean war, published in 1854–5. In spite of the extravagant narrations of feudal cruelty, these early works were inoffensive, never immoral nor irreligious. But their unreality, owing to their author's superficial knowledge of history, is very conspicuous. He contributed to the early volumes of the 'Illustrated London News,' started in 1842, and from 7 July 1849 to the end of 1851 edited the 'Home Circle.' In Nos. 53–119, vols. iii–v. of this work, ending 11 Oct. 1851, reappeared, extended and recast, his 'Quintyn Matsys, the Blacksmith of Antwerp,' afterwards reissued separately in library form with illustrations. An early edition had been published about 1839. He wrote in January 1857 for 'Reynolds's Miscellany,' Nos. 444–8, a popular Christmas story called 'The Waits;' since republished in John Dicks's series of 'English Novels,' No. 106. Also in 'Reynolds's Miscellany,' 'The False Step; or the Castle and the Cottage' (begun 21 Feb. 1857, ended 3 Oct., Nos. 450–82). He then transferred himself to the 'London Journal,' to the success of which he largely contributed, remaining one of its most attractive contributors until the end of his life. Sir John Gilbert illustrated many of the following works. On 5 Dec. 1857, in vol. xxvi. No. 667, appeared the first chapters of Egan's 'Flower of the Flock.' It ended in No. 689, and was next week followed by 'The Snake in the Grass' (8 May 1858, ending 27 Nov. 1858, in No. 720). A note from Pierce Egan to the public craved leave of absence for a brief period 'to recruit health and strength.' Otherwise he was singularly unobtrusive, and avoided all personal squabbles. He had married, and already had several children, enjoying a fair income derived from his literary work. He afterwards developed a completely different style from his early feudal extravagances, and delighted in rural scenes, intermingled with tragic incidents of town poverty and aristocratic splendour. Despite sensationalism and contrasts of ranks and classes, there was always a singular charm of purity and wholesome honesty in all his 'London Journal' serials. In 1858 and 1859 a new proprietor of the 'Journal,' to encourage a higher taste among the purchasers of penny miscellanies, dispensed with Egan's services and reprinted three novels by Sir Walter Scott. But the circulation of the 'Journal' diminished, so that Pierce Egan was again summoned to restore the popularity. This he attempted, somewhat hurriedly, with a slight story called 'The Love Test' (15 Jan. 1859, in vol. xxix., completed in No. 746 on 28 March). After a short interval he began a new story, with his best power, 'Love me, Leave me Not' (22 Oct. 1859, ending 30 June 1860, Nos. 767–803). In rapid succession, with undiminished success, there followed 'The Wonder of Kingswood Chace' (6 Oct. 1860 to 6 July 1861, Nos. 817–56); 'Imogine; or The Marble Heart' (7 Sept. 1861 to 14 June 1862, Nos. 865–905); 'The Scarlet Flower,' in which he went back to cavalier days (7 June 1862 to 15 Nov., Nos. 904–27); 'The Poor Girl,' one of his best known novels (on 1 Nov. 1862 to 5 Sept. 1863); 'Such is Life' (5 Dec. 1863 to 2 July 1864, Nos. 982–1012); 'Fair Lilias' (14 Jan. 1865 to 16 Dec. 1865, Nos. 1040–88); 'The Light of Love; or the Diamond and the Snowdrop' (28 April 1866 to 16 Feb. 1867, Nos. 1107–49); 'Eve; or The Angel of Innocence,' another widely popular work (18 May to 21 Dec. 1867, Nos. 1162–93). The incessant toil and excitement of such rapid production told on him, but 'Eve' embodied his best thoughts, which lacked neither poetry of expression nor some higher flights of imagination, such as his early years had never promised. His personal friends valued him for his manly qualities, and his readers admired him. He wrote nothing in vol. xlvii., but resumed on 5 Sept. 1868 with 'The Blue-eyed Witch; or not a Friend in the World' (ending 8 May 1869, Nos. 1230–65). Henceforward his powers diminished, as may be seen in his wild and ghastly story 'My Love Kate; or the Dreadful Secret' (6 Nov. 1869 to 7 May 1870, Nos. 1291–1317); and in his attempt to trade on his former success with 'The Poor Girl' (a study of a virtuous maiden triumphing over persecutions and temptations) by his adding a companion novel entitled 'The Poor Boy' (8 Oct. 1870 to 8 April 1871, Nos. 1339–65). Of other works the titles and dates were these: 'Mark Jarrett's Daisy, the Wild Flower of Hazelbrook' (25 Nov. 1871 to 25 May 1872, Nos. 1398–1424, in vol. lv.); 'Ever my Queen' (15 Feb. to 5 July 1873, Nos. 1462–1482); 'Her First Love' (21 March to 8 Aug. 1874, Nos. 1519–39, in vol. lx.); 'False and Frail' (13 Feb. to 19 June 1875, Nos. 1566–84); 'The Pride of Birth' (20 Nov. 1875 to 1 April 1876, Nos. 1606–25); 'Two Young Hearts' (25 Nov. 1876 to 14 April

1877, Nos. 1659–79); then, after short intervals, 'His Sworn Bride' (15 Dec. 1877 to 4 May 1878, Nos. 1714–34, in vol. lxvi.); 'Loved in Secret' (2 Nov. 1878 to 29 March 1879, Nos. 1760–81); and, his latest work of all, at first entitled 'A Shadow on the Threshold,' but the name having been anticipated elsewhere, it was changed to 'A Shadow on the Future' (13 Dec. 1879, ending on 6 March 1880, Nos. 1818–33, in vol. lxxi.) He was a liberal in politics, and had been for some time connected with the 'Weekly Times.' He is deservedly accounted 'one of the pioneers of cheap literature.' His 'Snake in the Grass' was republished in 1887. He died on 6 July 1880.

[Works mentioned above, with dates; obituary notice in Athenæum, No. 2750, p. 49, &c.]

J. W. E.

EGBERT or **ECGBERHT**, Saint (639–729), was an Angle, doubtless a Northumbrian, of noble lineage, who some time after 652 went to Ireland. Among his companions there were Æthelhun, brother of Æthelwine, subsequently bishop of Lindsey, and the more famous Ceadda. Young men visited Ireland either for study or to cultivate in its highest form the monastic life. Ecgberht was one of those who 'visited the cells of the masters,' and were entertained without cost and received gratuitous instruction from the hospitable islanders. But in 664 a terrible plague desolated both Britain and Ireland, and Ecgberht and Æthelwine were seized with the disorder when sojourning at the monastery of Rathmelsigi, a house placed by some in Connaught, and identified by others with Mellifont, near Drogheda, but in both cases on insufficient evidence. Fearing that death was at hand, Ecgberht, as Bæda was told by a hoary priest who had heard the story from Ecgberht himself, prayed that he might have time for repentance, and vowed solemnly that if he recovered he would never return to Britain, would recite the whole psalter every day, and would fast a day and a night in every week. His comrade died, but Ecgberht recovered and became a priest and a monk. For the rest of his long life he kept his vows and soon won a great reputation for humility, kindness, continency, simplicity, and justice. He added to his old vows a new one, that he would only refresh himself once a day in Lent, the forty days before Christmas, and the forty after Pentecost, and then only on a limited quantity of bread and skimmed milk. He was exceptionally learned in the scriptures. The students and monks from England sought his counsel. One of them, Higbald, afterwards an abbot in Lindsey, relates how Ecgberht told him that he knew a man in Ireland who on the night of Ceadda's death (2 March 672) saw in a vision the spirit of Cedd, his brother, descending from heaven with an angel host to fetch his brother to his reward in the celestial realms. Bæda suspected that Ecgberht himself had this vision, but is not sure. In later times, however, there was no hesitation in making Ecgberht the witness of this miracle (Flor. Wig. s. a. 672). Twelve years later Ecgberht boldly remonstrated with the rash Ecgfrith, king of the Northumbrians, who, as part of his policy of war against the Celtic neighbours and tributaries of his kingdom, carried on an unprovoked war with the friendly Irish. Ecgfrith's death next year in his war with the Picts was generally regarded as the penalty of his neglect of Ecgberht's counsel. Ecgberht's vow kept him away from Britain, but he was seized with an irresistible impulse to preach the gospel to the heathen Germans beyond the sea, especially the Frisians and the old Saxons. If this ambitious scheme should fail, he would at least be able to visit the threshold of the apostles at Rome. He chose his companions and his ship, but at the last moment a monk from Melrose who was among them was warned by his old abbot, Boisil, in a dream to tell Ecgberht to desist, and visit instead the monasteries of Columba. Ecgberht hesitated until the message was repeated in a second and clearer vision. A storm now cast his ship on the coast, and he finally desisted from his missionary journey. But he encouraged others to go where it was forbidden for him to enter. Wihtberht, an Englishman, long an anchorite in Ireland, undertook the Frisian mission in 690. He laboured two years without result and then returned in despair. But in 692 Ecgberht found in Willibrord [q. v.] and his twelve companions more fortunate missionaries. It was not, however, until some years had elapsed that Ecgberht proceeded to fulfil the divine command. He was still living among the Scots when about 705 he was consulted by Eanmund, the Northumbrian noble whom the cruelty of King Osred had driven into a monastery. At the monk's request Ecgberht consecrated an altar for the monastery of St. Peter. He also bade Eanmund build a chapel on a hill covered with thorn coverts, the haunt of robbers. Eanmund fulfilled his request. Perhaps Utan the Scot, one of Eanmund's most zealous disciples, came from Ecgberht (Æthelwulf, 'Carmen de abbatibus cellæ suæ,' in T. Arnold's *Symeon of Durham*, i. 270–3, Rolls Ser.) It is remarkable that the relator of this story speaks of Ecgberht as

bishop, while Bæda always describes him as a presbyter. But Alcuin twice (*Vita S. Willibrordi*; and *Versus de Sanctus Eboracensis Ecclesiæ*, in JAFFÉ, vi. 43, 112) describes Ecgberht as a bishop, just as Æthelwulf does. Despite the sanctity of Ecgberht's life and his orthodoxy on all the points of controversy between the Roman and Celtic churches, Bæda either ignores or forgets that he had in any sense the character of a bishop.

At last, in 716, Ecgberht went on his mission to Iona. The Celtic Easter and tonsure had already lost ground even in the centre of Celtic christianity. Adamnan [q. v.] had become since 686 an advocate of the Roman usages; and after the synod of Tara in 692 all the northern Scots but a few Columban monasteries had conformed to Rome. It was about this time that Ecgberht became anxious for their conversion, though he himself could hardly have been of the Celtic party even before this. But on Adamnan's death schism broke out in Iona. When Ecgberht arrived in 716 he found two rival abbots, though doubtless the larger party were with the Abbot Dunchad on the Roman side. The traditions of the place tended powerfully for the local usages. Ecgberht's eloquence and earnestness turned the monks from their old ways. In 716 both Irish and English annalists commemorate the abandonment of the Celtic Easter at Iona (Tighernac, in SKENE, *Chron. Picts and Scots*, p. 73; *Anglo-Saxon Chron.* s. a. 716). In 717 Dunchad died, and Faelchu, the rival abbot, found his cause strengthened by the fugitive Columban monks expelled in that year from the dominions of Nectan, king of the Picts. Ecgberht still persevered. In 718 he forced on Iona the Roman tonsure (Tighernac, in SKENE, p. 74). But the struggle was long and severe, and the victory gradual. Ecgberht never left Iona, and doubtless found his work there in subduing the last traces of the schism. But his influence extended over the greater part of the land of the Scots. He had now attained an unusual age. He was ninety years old when, on Easter day (24 April) 729, he suddenly died, just after he had completed the celebration of mass. In him, as Bæda says, the English repaid to the Scots their gift of christianity by recalling them to the true catholic knowledge of Easter. It was little less than a miracle that he died on Easter day. He was revered as a saint as early as the times of Alcuin.

[Bædæ Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, iii. 4, 27, iv. 3, 26, v. 9, 10, 22; Chronicles of the Picts and Scots, ed. Skene, pp. 73, 74; Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, s.a. 716, 729; Æthelwulf, in Symeon of Durham, ed. T. Arnold, i. 270–3 (Rolls Ser.); Jaffé's Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum, vi. 43, 112; Skene's Celtic Scotland, ii. 278–81, corrects Bæda by comparison with the Irish sources; Lanigan's Ecclesiastical History of Ireland, iii. 95, 135.] T. F. T.

EGBERT or **ECGBERHT** (*d.* 766), archbishop of York, son of Eata and cousin of Ceolwulf [q. v.], the king of Northumbria, to whom Bæda dedicated his 'History,' was sent by his father to a monastery to receive his education. When he had grown up he went to Rome with his brother Ecgred, and was ordained deacon there. Ecgred died at Rome, and Ecgberht returned home alone. He was appointed to the see of York by Ceolwulf, probably in 732 (*Carmen de Pontiff.* 1284; *Addit. ad Bædam*, 734; *A.-S. Chron.* 735, SYMEON), and Bæda thereupon wrote him a long letter of advice as to his life and doctrine, the administration of his diocese, the evils that prevailed among the clergy, the corrupt state of the monasteries, and the measures of reform that he desired him to adopt ('Ad Ecgberctum antistitem,' *Opera Hist. Min.* 207–26). As a means of restoring discipline, he urged him to forward the erection of new bishoprics and the fulfilment of the scheme of Pope Gregory, which invested the see of York with metropolitan authority by the gift of the pall. Acting on this advice Ecgberht obtained his pall at Rome from Gregory III in 735, and thus became the second archbishop of York; for as none of his predecessors since Paulinus received the vestment, they are not entitled to a higher title than that of bishop (*Anglia Sacra*, i. 66). His power was evidently greatly increased by the accession of his brother Eadberht [q. v.] to the Northumbrian throne in 738; he worked in perfect harmony with him, exercised full authority in ecclesiastical matters, and issued coins bearing his own name along with that of the king. He was learned, just, gracious, and liberal. He enriched the churches of his diocese with many splendid gifts, took care to ordain worthy men as priests, and paid attention to the cultivation of church music. Above all, he founded the school attached to his cathedral church. In this school the range of teaching was wide, and besides divinity included the study of classical authors, and especially of Virgil, of grammar, arts, and science. The work of teaching was mainly confided to Albert (Æthelberht), who succeeded Ecgberht as archbishop, and here among other scholars of note was educated Alcuin (Eahlwine), who also took part in the direction of the school. In the anonymous 'Life of Alcuin' we are told that Ecgberht each morning, as soon as his business was transacted, used to sit on his couch

and instruct his young clerks till midday; he then prayed privately and celebrated mass. At dinner he ate sparingly, and listened to his scholars discussing literary questions. In the evening he always said the compline service with them, and then gave each his blessing singly (*Vita Alcuini, Bibl. rerum Germ.* Jaffé, iv. 10, 11). He corresponded with the English missionary Boniface, who wrote to him thanking him for his gifts, asking him to send him the 'Commentaries' of Bæda, and consulting him on a question of church discipline (epp. 60, 100). In 758 he received into his monastery his brother Eadberht, who voluntarily resigned his crown and became a monk. He died on 19 Nov. 766, after having ruled the diocese for thirty-four years (*Carmen de Pontiff.*; thirty-two years, Symeon), and was buried in one of the porches or chapels of his cathedral church. A letter of Paul I, with a superscription addressing it to Ecgberht as well as Eadberht, was really written to the king alone (*Councils and Eccl. Docs.* iii. 394–6). Ecgberht wrote: 1. 'The Pontificale,' or a book of ritual, first printed by the Surtees Society, vol. xxvi. 1853. 2. The 'Succinctus Dialogus Ecclesiasticæ Institutionis,' printed with two epistles of Bæda by Ware 1664, by Wharton 1693, by Wilkins in his 'Concilia' 1737, by Thorpe in his 'Ancient Laws and Institutes' 1840, and by Haddan and Stubbs in their 'Councils,' &c., 1851. 3. 'The Pœnitentiale,' printed by Haddan and Stubbs in their 'Councils,' &c., iii. 413 sq., from the text of Wasserschleben, which presents what may be taken as the genuine work of the archbishop. Other versions of the 'Penitential' ascribed to Ecgberht have been printed by Spelman, Wilkins, and Thorpe, but in each case his work has been mixed up with much that is clearly extraneous. A book of 'Excerptiones,' also ascribed to him, is of later date. The editors of the 'Councils,' &c. (see above), in a learned note on the works attributed to Ecgberht, consider that 'it seems rather more probable than not' that he may have translated the Anglo-Saxon version or paraphrase of the 'Confessionale' from the 'Penitential' of the 'so-called Cummeanus.' Other writings of which, if they ever existed, no traces now remain are ascribed to him by Bale (*Scriptt. Brit.* cent. ii. 109).

[Carmen de Pontiff. Ebor. Eccl. 1247–86, Historians of York, i. 386; Symeon of Durham, Hist. Eccl. Dunelm. ii. 3 (Rolls Ser.); Bædæ Opera Hist. Minora, pp. 207–26 (Engl. Hist. Soc.); William of Malmesbury, Gesta Pontiff. p. 245 (Rolls Ser.); Addit. ad Bædam, Mon. Hist. Brit. p. 288; Vita Alcuini, Jaffé, pp. 10, 11; Bonifacii Epistolæ, Jaffé, epp. 60, 100; Raine's Fasti Ebor. p. 94 sq.; Haddan and Stubbs's Councils and Eccl. Docs. iii. 358 sq., 388 sq., 413 sq.; Wright's Biog. Lit. i. 297 sq.; Dict. of Christian Biog., art. 'Egbert,' by Canon Raine.]

W. H.

EGBERT, ECGBERHT, or ECGBRYHT (*d.* 839), king of the West-Saxons, son of Ealhmund, an under-king of the kingdom of Kent, which at this time, besides Kent, included Surrey, Sussex, and Essex (*A.-S. Chron.* sub an. 823), was when a young man banished from England by the joint action of Offa, king of Mercia, and Beorhtric [q. v.], king of Wessex. He represented the branch of the house of Cerdic that sprang from Cuthwine, the son of Ceawlin [q. v.], for his father was the great-grandson of Ingils, the brother of Ine. The West-Saxon kingship had departed from his house when Ine was succeeded by his kinsman Æthelheard. When the West-Saxon king, Cynegils, died in 786, Ealhmund was reigning in Kent, and probably died shortly afterwards; for soon after Beorhtric succeeded Cynegils the pretensions of Ecgberht were held to endanger his throne. Beorhtric forced him to take refuge in Mercia, and sent an embassy to Offa offering alliance and requesting that the fugitive might be given up. Offa determined to support Beorhtric, probably because the accession of Ecgberht to the West-Saxon kingdom might have led to the withdrawal of Kent from the Mercian over-lordship and its union with Wessex; he therefore made alliance with the West-Saxon king, gave him his daughter Eadburh [q. v.] to wife in 789, and joined him in driving Ecgberht out of England. Ecgberht took refuge with the Frankish king, Charles, afterwards the emperor Charles the Great (Charlemagne), who entertained many exiles from the different English kingdoms. The date of Ecgberht's banishment and its duration are uncertain. The 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' (sub an. 836), Florence of Worcester (i. 69), and Henry of Huntingdon (p. 733) say that his exile lasted for three years; William of Malmesbury (*Gesta Regum*, sec. 105) makes it last for thirteen years. While, as far as written evidence goes, the period of three years thus rests on strong ground, it is less probable than the other. Ecgberht certainly came to the throne in 802 (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* Introd. p. 87; *Eccl. Documents*, iii. 557, the dates of the 'Chronicle' needing correction by two years at this period), and it is likely that he returned to England in that year on the death of Beorhtric; his exile, however, could not have begun three years before that date, as Offa was then dead. If the account given in the 'Chronicle' is to be accepted, his return must have taken place

on the death of Offa in 796, and his exile in 793, a date which seems to have no significance in this connection, while if William of Malmesbury's statement of the matter is correct, his exile would coincide with the marriage of Beorhtric to Offa's daughter, and would come to an end when, on the death of Beorhtric, he returned to England to ascend the West-Saxon throne; and it is highly probable that Malmesbury based his story on some version of the 'Chronicle' that has not been preserved. According to this theory, then, Ecgberht was banished in 789, and remained with Charles for thirteen years. Nothing is known of his life during his exile save that Henry of Huntingdon records the tradition that he dwelt in honour. At the same time account must be taken of the influence that his long stay at the court of the Frankish monarch must have had on his future career, of the lessons in war and empire that he must have learnt there. He returned to England in 802, and was accepted by the West-Saxons as their king. No opposition seems to have been offered to his accession by Cenwulf of Mercia, and it may reasonably be supposed that his acquiescence had been secured by the emperor (*Making of England*, p. 431). Nothing is recorded of Ecgberht for the next thirteen years; for the statement that appears in the register of a hospital at York that soon after his accession he held a 'parliament' at Winchester, in which he ordered that the name of his kingdom should be changed from Britain to England (*Monasticon*, vi. 608), does not need confuting here. It should, however, be noted that he dates certain charters granted in the later years of his reign (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 1035, 1036, 1038) by the year of his 'ducatus,' which he refers to 812 or 813 (Stubbs, art. 'Egbert,' *Dictionary of Christian Biography*). Whatever he may have meant by the term 'ducatus,' it certainly points to some accession of dignity, and as in 815 (*A.-S. Chron.* sub an. 813) he 'laid waste West Wales [Cornwall] from eastward to westward,' it has been conjectured (Stubbs) that he refers to the beginning of this war, which in later days he probably regarded as the first step towards the attainment of the leadership he afterwards won. From 815 he does not appear again until 824, when he held a meeting of the West-Saxon witan at Acle, probably Oakley in Hampshire (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 1031). The next year was evidently marked by a rising of the West Welsh, who were defeated by the men of Devon at Gafulford or Camelford, a war in which Ecgberht took part in person (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, sub an. 823; Florence; Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 1033; Stubbs).

As soon as Ecgberht had overthrown the Welsh of Cornwall he had to repel a Mercian invasion. The greatness of Mercia had been shaken by civil discord since the death of Cenwulf in 821; his successor was deposed, and another king, Beornwulf, chosen in his place. Beornwulf, who no doubt took advantage of the rising of the Welsh, seems to have marched far into Wessex. Ecgberht defeated him at Ellandune, probably in the neighbourhood of Winchester, for Hun, an ealdorman who fell in the battle, was buried there (Æthelweard, p. 510). The slaughter was great on both sides, and the 'river of blood' that was shed was commemorated in popular verse (Henry of Huntingdon, p. 733). Beornwulf fled, and set himself to gather another army. From Ellandune Ecgberht sent his son Æthelwulf, Ealhstan, the bishop of Sherborne, and an ealdorman, with a large force, to regain his father's kingdom of Kent. Baldred, king of Kent [q.v.], was driven across the Thames, and the people of Kent, Surrey, Sussex, and Essex willingly submitted to Ecgberht as the rightful successor of his father. The king and people of East Anglia, who were under the over-lordship of Mercia, also sent to him seeking his 'peace and protection.' On this Beornwulf led his army against them, and began to lay waste the country, but they defeated and slew him (825), and remained under the over-lordship of Ecgberht (Florence, i. 66; Henry of Huntingdon, p. 733). Mercia, however, was not yet subdued, for Beornwulf was succeeded by Ludecan, who made another attempt to subdue East Anglia, and was likewise defeated and slain in 828. He was succeeded by Wiglaf. Ecgberht, however, at once led an army against him, drove him from the kingdom, and received the submission of Mercia. In 829 he marched against Northumbria, and the Northumbrians met him on the border of their land at Dore in Derbyshire, and there submitted to him and took him for their lord. Under this year (827, correctly 829) the 'Chronicle' says of him that he was the eighth Bretwalda. He had for the first time united all the English race under one over-lordship, and, though there were future divisions of his empire, his work was never wholly undone (*Making of England*, p. 436). He was not king of England, for the idea of a territorial kingship belongs to a later period. Nor was he the immediate ruler of the peoples that had submitted to him; they still had kings of their own, who were dependent on the West-Saxon overlord, and in 830 Ecgberht restored Wiglaf

to the throne of Mercia as under-king. In the case of Kent, where the kingship had come to an end, Ecgberht adopted a special policy. The kingdom was important, both as the seat of the ecclesiastical government of England, and as the district most closely connected with the continent. At the same time the greatness of the primate, and the strong local feeling that had manifested itself in opposition to Mercia, rendered it unadvisable to attempt a policy of absolute annexation. Accordingly Ecgberht, who regarded the kingdom as peculiarly his own, bestowed it on his son Æthelwulf, probably in 828 (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 223, 224), and it remained attached to the heir to the West-Saxon throne until it was united with the rest of the south of England on the succession of Æthelberht to the kingdom of Wessex (*Constitutional Hist.* i. 172). There is some uncertainty as to the date at which Ecgberht made his son king of Kent, and it is further questioned (*Eccl. Documents*, iii. 557) whether the subjugation of the country took place before 827, the date assigned to it in the St. Albans compilation (Wendover). There seem, however, sufficient grounds for the dates given here. Ecgberht's 'charters' record a few personal incidents, such as his presence at the war of 825, and his grants, not many in number, to churches, and especially to Winchester (Kemble, *Codex Dipl.* 1033, 1035 sq.) In a charter of 828 (*ib.* 223) he is styled 'rex Anglorum;' this, however, must not be taken as signifying more than the over-lordship of East Anglia; the same style was used by Offa in 772 (*ib.* 102); and in 830 he is described simply as 'king of the West-Saxons and Kentishmen,' and in 833 as 'king of the West-Saxons' (*ib.* 224, 232). His description as 'king of Kent and other nations' in another charter of 833 (*ib.* 234) does not necessarily imply any termination of Æthelwulf's authority; Ecgberht was presiding over a meeting of the Kentish witan, and naturally used the style of the kingdom; it is, however, curious that Æthelwulf's name does not occur among the witnesses (*Eccl. Documents*, iii. 557). Coins of Ecgberht are rare, though specimens are extant struck by about nineteen different moneyers. On some of these, besides his name and title of 'rex,' there is 'Saxo,' on others 'M,' and on others 'A,' signifying respectively his kingship over the West-Saxons. Mercians, and East Anglians (Kenyon; Stubbs). Nothing is known certainly as to Ecgberht's administrative work in his immediate kingdom of Wessex. It has, however, been conjectured with great probability that he brought the shire organisation to its completion there, both as regards the relations of the bishop with the shire and the appointment of the ealdorman as the leader of the shire force or 'fyrd,' an arrangement which enabled the West-Saxons to offer a spirited resistance to the Scandinavian invaders (*Conquest of England*, pp. 47, 68–70, 233). His dealings with the church of Canterbury are of peculiar importance. The Mercian kings had attempted to depress the power of the archbishops; Ecgberht made it a means of strengthening his own position. He probably procured the election of Ceolnoth in 832, who may have been a West-Saxon (Robertson). At all events he was in full accord with him, and in 838, at an ecclesiastical council held at Kingston, he and his son Æthelwulf entered into an agreement of perpetual alliance with the archbishop and church of Canterbury, the archbishop promising for himself, his church, and his successors unbroken friendship to the kings and their heirs, and the kings giving assurances of protection, liberty of election, and peace. A charter containing a similar agreement with the bishop and church of Winchester is, if genuine, an imitation of that drawn up at Kingston (*Eccl. Documents*, iii. 617–20).

The restoration of Wiglaf was probably caused by some hostile movement of the Welsh on the Mercian border, which rendered it advisable to secure the fidelity and provide for the defence of the kingdom; for in that year (831) Ecgberht led an army against the 'North Welsh' (the people of the present Wales) and compelled them to acknowledge his over-lordship. In 834 his dominions were invaded by the Scandinavian pirates, who plundered the isle of Sheppey. The next year they came to Charmouth in Dorsetshire with thirty-five ships and landed there. Ecgberht fought a fierce battle with them there and was defeated. Two years later, in 837, a great fleet of northmen, probably from Ireland (*Conquest of England*, p. 67), sailed over to Cornwall, and the West Welsh rose against the West-Saxon dominion and joined the invaders. Ecgberht met the allies at Hengestdune, immediately to the west of the Tamar, and routed them completely. He died in 839 (*A.-S. Chron.* sub an. 836), after a reign of thirty-seven years and seven months, and was succeeded by his son Æthelwulf.

[Anglo-Saxon Chron. (Rolls Ser.); Florence of Worcester (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Henry of Huntingdon and Æthelweard, Mon. Hist. Brit.; William of Malmesbury's Gesta Regum (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Kemble's Codex Diplomaticus (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Hawkins's Silver Coins, ed. Ken-

yon, vol. iii.; Haddan and Stubbs's Ecclesiastical Documents, vol. iii. Much light is thrown on the chronology of Ecgberht's reign, p. 557, in Bishop Stubbs's Introd. to Roger Hoveden, i. xc–xcviii, and in the Introduction to the Codex Dipl.; for the other side of the question see Hardy's Introd. to Mon. Hist. Brit. p. 120; Stubbs's Constitutional History, i. 172, 235, and his exhaustive art. 'Egbert,' Dict. of Christian Biog.; Green's Making of England, and Conquest of England; Robertson's Historical Essays, p. 200.] W. H.

EGERTON, CHARLES CHANDLER (1798–1885), surgeon, was born at his father's vicarage of Thorncombe in Dorsetshire in April 1798, and received his medical education at the then united hospitals of St. Thomas's and Guy's. In 1819 he became a member of the College of Surgeons. Four years later he was appointed by the East India Company assistant-surgeon on the Bengal establishment to practise as an oculist, and especially to take charge of those Indo-European lads at the lower orphan school who had contracted disease of the eyes. He dealt successfully with the epidemic there, and during his stay in India he held the first position as an oculist at the Eye Hospital, which was established under his own immediate care, and afterwards at the Medical College Hospital. He was appointed the first surgeon at the Calcutta Medical College Hospital, and held that position until he retired from the service. The establishment of the college for teaching the natives anatomy by actual dissection was mainly due to his exertions. Early in 1847 he left India, and, retiring from practice, resided at Kendal Lodge, Epping, until his death, which took place there in May 1885, at the age of eighty-seven.

[Address of the President of the Royal Medico-Chirurgical Society of London on 1 March 1886.] J. D.

EGERTON, DANIEL (1772–1835), actor, was born in the city of London on 14 April 1772. According to various accounts, presumably supplied by himself, he was 'bred to the law in a public office.' The 'Thespian Dictionary,' 1805, says, however, 'he was in business near Whitechapel, and made his first attempt on the stage in this assumed name at the Royalty Theatre.' He played also once or twice for benefits at the Haymarket. On 4 June 1799 he made, as Captain Absolute in 'The Rivals,' his first appearance at the Birmingham theatre, then under the management of the elder Macready. Here he remained two summers, playing during the winter months with Stephen Kemble in Edinburgh. On 28 Nov. 1801, as Millamour in Murphy's 'Know your own Mind,' he made his first appearance at Newcastle, and on 17 May 1803, as Frederick in the 'Poor Gentleman,' was first seen in Bath, where he also played Jaffier in 'Venice Preserved,' and other characters. After the departure of Elliston from Bath, Egerton took Jaques, Lord Townly, Mr. Oakley in 'The Jealous Wife,' Rolla in 'Pizarro,' and many important parts. He left Bath for London in 1809, appearing on 28 Oct. at Covent Garden during the O. P. riots as Lord Avondale in the 'School of Reform.' In tragedy King Henry VIII, Tullus Aufidius in 'Coriolanus,' Syphax in 'Cato,' and Clytus in 'Alexander the Great' were esteemed his best parts. From this time until close upon his death he remained a member of the Covent Garden company, his chief occupation being secondary characters in tragedy or serious drama and what is technically called 'heavy business.' While engaged at Covent Garden he assumed the management first of Sadler's Wells (1821–1824), and of the Olympic (1821). He acted himself at neither house, though his wife, Sarah Egerton [q. v.], constituted at both a principal attraction. His conduct of the Olympic embroiled him for a time with the management of Covent Garden. It was, however, a failure and was soon abandoned. On 1 July 1833, in conjunction with William Abbot [q. v.], his associate at Covent Garden, he opened the Victoria Theatre, previously known as the Coburg. In 1834 he retired from the management ruined, and died in July (22nd, *Era Almanack*; 24th, Oxberry, *Dramatic Chronology*) of the following year. He was five feet ten inches in height, of strong and rather portly appearance. Contemporary criticism charges him with listlessness in his acting. The 'Thespian Dictionary' says he gave in Birmingham in 1800 an entertainment of his own extracted from Stevens's 'Lecture on Heads,' &c., and entitled 'Whimsicalities.' A portrait of him as Clytus in 'Alexander the Great' is in the 'Theatrical Inquisitor,' vol. xi.

[Genest's Account of the English Stage; Theatrical Inquisitor, October 1817; Theatrical Biog. 1824; Thespian Dict.; Oxberry's Dramatic Biog. 1825, vol. iii.; Era Almanack, 1872, 1873; Era newspaper, 15 Aug. 1847; London Mag. 1821; Sir F. Pollock's Macready's Reminiscences.] J. K.

EGERTON, FRANCIS, third and last Duke of Bridgewater (1736–1803), was a younger son of Scroop, first duke, by his second wife, Lady Rachel Russell, daughter of Wriothesley, duke of Bedford. In early boyhood he lost his father. His mother in the first year of her widowhood married Sir Richard

Lyttelton of Hagley, and neglected the boy, who was not only sickly, but apparently of such feeble intellect that his exclusion from the succession to the dukedom was actually contemplated. By the death of his elder brother he became, however, at twelve Duke of Bridgewater, and at seventeen, ignorant, awkward, and unruly, he was sent abroad by his guardians to make the grand tour, with Wood, the well-known Eastern traveller and dissertator on Homer, as his travelling tutor. Wood induced his pupil to buy some marbles and other objects of art at Rome, but the young duke took so little interest in these matters that they remained in their packing-cases until after his death. On his return home he kept racehorses for several years, and occasionally rode them himself. He had attained his majority when he proposed to and was accepted by the widowed Elizabeth, duchess of Hamilton, one of the 'beautiful Miss Gunnings.' Scandal made free with her sister Lady Coventry's reputation, and the duke insisted that after marriage the Duchess of Hamilton's intimacy with her should cease. On her refusal the duke broke off the match, and in his twenty-third year quitted London in disgust to settle on his Lancashire property at Old Hall, Worsley, near Manchester, and devote himself to the development of its resources. These lay mainly in the Worsley coal mines, the demand for the products of which the duke saw would be much increased by a diminution in the cost of transport to Manchester. He had obtained from parliament (March 1759) an act authorising him to make from Worsley to Salford a canal which was to enter the Irwell and go up its other bank by means of locks. A very different plan was urged on the duke by James Brindley [q. v.], who in 1758 had been employed by the duke's brother-in-law and friend, Earl Gower, afterwards first Marquis of Stafford, in making the surveys for a canal to connect the Trent and the Mersey. In July 1759 Brindley visited the duke at Old Hall, and persuaded him to project the construction of a canal from Worsley to Manchester, which should be carried in an aqueduct over the Irwell at Barton, three miles from Worsley. The scheme was ridiculed, but the duke adopted it, and early in 1760 obtained an act of parliament sanctioning it. Brindley's ingenuity overcame all the many difficulties of construction. On 17 July 1761 the first boatload of coals was borne along the Barton aqueduct, which forthwith attracted visitors from all parts. This canal was the first in England which throughout its course was entirely independent of a natural stream; hence Bridgewater has been called the founder of British inland navigation. The price of the Worsley coal alone at Manchester was reduced through it fully one half.

The duke and Brindley were soon engaged in a still more difficult enterprise, the construction of a canal from Longford Bridge to Runcorn, to connect Manchester and Liverpool. The proprietors of the navigation of the Mersey and Irwell opposed the bill for the new canal, and were joined by some Lancashire landowners, the opposition to the bill in the House of Commons being led by Lord Strange, the son of the Earl of Derby. Moreover, the duke and his friends being whigs, many tories opposed his bill, which after a fierce contest received the royal assent in March 1762. The new canal, about twenty-eight miles in length, was nearly three times as long as that from Worsley to Manchester, and had to be carried over streams and bogs, and through tunnels, presenting great engineering difficulties. The financial difficulty taxed the duke's pecuniary resources to the uttermost. He had not only to defray the cost of construction, which was very heavy, though Brindley's own wages were only a guinea a week, but to compensate owners for land compulsorily acquired. He could hardly get a bill for 500*l.* cashed in Liverpool. His steward had often to ride about among the tenantry and raise 5*l.* here and there to pay the week's wages. The duke cut down his own personal expenses until his establishment cost only 400*l.* a year. He would not raise money on his landed property, but in 1765 he pledged the Worsley canal, which had become remunerative, to Messrs. Child, the London bankers, for 25,000*l.*, and in 1767 a lucrative traffic was springing up on the portion of the new canal, which in that year was finished, with the exception of the locks leading down to the Mersey. On the last day of 1772 these too were opened, and a vessel of fifty tons burden passed through on its way to Liverpool. The duke was afterwards a liberal promoter of the Grand Trunk Navigation, and his interest was always at the service of any well-digested plan of the kind (Chalmers). On his own canals he had expended 220,000*l.* The annual revenue which they yielded him ultimately reached 80,000*l.*

During the remainder of his life Bridgewater continued, more or less actively, to superintend and develope his collieries and canals. He bought up any land in the neighbourhood of Worsley which contained coal-seams, and spent nearly 170,000*l.* in forming subterranean tunnels for the egress of the coals, the underground canals which connected the various workings extending to forty miles in length. He introduced pas-

senger boats on his other canals, and frequently travelled by them. About 1796 he tried steam tugs on them, but without success. He was a stern, but just and good master, and looked well after the housing of his miners, establishing shops and markets for them, and taking care that they contributed to a sick club. His features are said to have strongly resembled those of George III. He was careless in his dress, which is described as 'something of the cut of Dr. Johnson's.' Within doors he was a great smoker, and out of doors as great a snuff-taker. He talked little on any subject but canals, and never wrote a letter when he could avoid it. He despised the ornamental, and once on his return from London finding that some flowers had been planted at Worsley, he 'whipped their heads off, and ordered them to be rooted up.' The money which he devoted to the purchase of the magnificent Bridgewater collection of paintings he probably regarded simply as a good business investment. To avoid the expense of a town establishment, when he visited London, where he had not many friends, he agreed with one of them to be provided for a stipulated sum with a daily dinner for himself and a few guests. Yet he was a liberal donor to national and beneficent institutions, and when he thought his country to be in danger he subscribed 100,000*l.* to the Loyalty Loan. In politics he took no very active part, generally following the lead of the Marquis of Stafford. He never married, and would not allow a woman servant to wait on him. He died in London, after a short illness, 3 March 1803, and was buried—his funeral being, according to his directions, the simplest possible—in the family vault at Ashridge, his Hertfordshire seat. He has been called 'the first great Manchester man.' The dukedom of Bridgewater died with him. Ashridge was among his bequests to his cousin and successor in the earldom of Bridgewater, General Edward Egerton, and to his nephew, the second Marquis of Stafford, afterwards first duke of Sutherland, he left other estates and much valuable property. His canal property he devolved, under trust, to that nephew's second son, known successively as Lord Francis Leveson-Gower, as Lord Francis Egerton, and as first Earl of Ellesmere, whose article on aqueducts and canals, contributed to the 'Quarterly Review' for March 1844, contains a very interesting account of his benefactor. There is a copy of Bridgewater's elaborate will in the Additional MSS., Brit. Mus., No. 10605.

[History of Inland Navigation, particularly those of the Duke of Bridgewater, 1766; Lord Ellesmere's Essays contributed to the Quarterly Review, 1858; Smiles's Lives of the Engineers, 1861, vol. i., Life of James Brindley; Francis Henry, Earl of Bridgewater's Letter to the Parisians . . . on Inland Navigation, containing a defence of . . . Francis Egerton, late Duke of Bridgewater (1719–20); Chalmers's Biog. Dict.; F. Espinasse's Lancashire Worthies, 1st ser. 1874.]

F. E.

EGERTON, FRANCIS, Earl of Ellesmere (1800–1857), statesman and poet, was born at 21 Arlington Street, Piccadilly, London, on 1 Jan. 1800. He was the younger son of George Granville Leveson-Gower, second marquis of Stafford, who was created Duke of Sutherland in 1833, the year of his death, by Elizabeth, countess of Sutherland, only daughter of William Gordon, seventeenth earl of Sutherland. Francis was at Eton from 1811 to 1814, when he proceeded to Christ Church, Oxford. On 6 Aug. 1819 he became a lieutenant in the Staffordshire regiment of yeomanry, and was promoted to a captaincy on 27 Sept. in the same year. He was elected M.P. for Bletchingley, Surrey, 19 Feb. 1822, and commenced his public career as a liberal-conservative of the Canning school. He spoke eloquently in behalf of free trade more than twenty years before Sir Robert Peel had embraced that policy; carried in the House of Commons a motion for the endowment of the catholic clergy, and warmly supported the project of the London University. On 26 June 1826 he became M.P. for Sutherlandshire, was re-elected for that county in 1830, and afterwards sat for South Lancashire in the parliaments of 1835, 1837, 1841, and until July 1846. In the meantime he had held office as a lord of the treasury (April to September 1827), under-secretary of state for the colonies (January to May 1828), chief secretary to the Marquis of Anglesey, lord-lieutenant of Ireland (21 June 1828 to 30 July 1830), and secretary at war (30 July to 30 Nov. 1830). He was named a privy councillor 28 June 1828, and a privy councillor for Ireland 9 Aug. 1828. At an early age he attempted literature, and in 1823 brought out a poor translation of 'Faust, a drama, by Goethe, and Schiller's song of the Bell.' On the death of his father in 1833 he assumed the surname and arms of Egerton alone, 24 Aug., in the place of his patronymic of Leveson-Gower, and under the will of his uncle, Francis Henry Egerton [q. v.], eighth earl of Bridgewater, became the owner of a property estimated at 90,000*l.* per annum. At the commemoration at Oxford on 10 June 1834 he was created D.C.L., named a trustee of the National Gallery on 26 Feb. 1835, and rector of King's College, Aberdeen, in October 1838. He spent the winter of 1839 in the East, pro-

ceeding in his own yacht to the Mediterranean and the Holy Land. The result of his observations appeared in 'Mediterranean Sketches,' 1843. A portion of his wealth was put to a generous use in his support of men of genius and in his building a gallery at his town residence in Cleveland Row, to which the public were very freely admitted, for the magnificent collection of paintings which he had inherited. On 30 June 1846 he was created Viscount Brackley of Brackley and Earl of Ellesmere of Ellesmere, and on 7 Feb. 1855 was made a knight of the Garter. He was president of the British Association at the Manchester meeting in 1842, served as president of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1849, and was president of the Royal Geographical Society 1854–5. He died at Bridgewater House, London, on 18 Feb. 1857, and was buried at Worsley, near Manchester, on 26 Feb., where a monument, designed by G. G. Scott, R.A., was erected in 1860. He married, on 18 June 1822, Harriet Catherine, only daughter of Charles Greville, by Charlotte, eldest daughter of William, third duke of Portland. She was born on 1 Jan. 1800 and died on 17 April 1866. She was the author or translator of: 1. 'Questions on the Epistles,' parts vii. and viii., 1832. 2. 'Journal of a Tour in the Holy Land in May and June 1840, with lithographic views from original drawings by Lord F. Egerton,' 1841. 3. 'The Believer's Guide to the Holy Communion, by J. H. Grand-Pierre; a translation,' 1849. Ellesmere was the author, translator, or editor of the following works: 1. 'Faust, a drama, by Goethe, and Schiller's song of the Bell,' 1823. 2. 'Translations from the German and original Poems,' 1824. 3. 'Boyle Farm,' 1827. 4. 'Wallenstein's Camp and original Poems,' 1830. 5. 'Dramatic Scenes, founded on Victor Hugo's tragedy of Hernani.' Printed in the Club Book, 1831. 6. 'Catherine of Cleves and Hernani, tragedies translated from the French,' 1832, another edit. 1854. 7. 'The Paria, a tragedy; by M. Beer,' 1836. 8. 'Alfred, a drama,' 1840. 9. 'Blue Beard, a tragedy,' 1841. 10. 'Mediterranean Sketches,' 1843. 11. 'The Campaign of 1812 in Russia, by Charles Clausewitz,' 1843. 12. 'The Siege of Vienna by the Turks, from the German of K. A. Schimmer,' 1847; new edit. 1861. 13. 'National Defences, letters of Lord Ellesmere,' 1848. 14. 'A Guide to Northern Archæology,' 1848. 15. 'History of the War of the Sicilian Vespers, by Michael Amari,' 1850. 16. 'Military Events in Italy,' 1848–9; translated from the German, 1851. 17. 'Solwan, or the Waters of Comfort, by Ibn Zafer,' 1852. 18. 'On the Life and Character of the Duke of Wellington,' 1852; second edition, 1852. 19. 'History of the two Tartar Conquerors of China, from the French of Père J. d'Orléans,' 1854. 20. 'Addresses to the Royal Geographical Society of London,' 2 vols. 1854, 1855. 21. 'The War in the Crimea, a discourse,' 1855. 22. 'The Pilgrimage and other Poems,' 1856. 23. 'Essays on History, Biography, Geography, Engineering,' &c., contributed to the 'Quarterly Review,' 1858. 24. 'King Alfred and Blue Beard,' reprinted in T. H. Lacy's 'Juvenile Plays,' 1871. 25. 'Donna Charitea, poems.' 26. 'The Mill.' Some of these works were privately printed, and others after publication were withdrawn from circulation. His version of Alexandre Dumas' tragedy, 'Henri III et sa Cour,' entitled 'Catherine of Cleves,' was performed with much success at Covent Garden, Charles Kemble and his daughter Fanny appearing in the piece.

[Gent. Mag. March 1857, p. 358; Illustrated London News, 24 Jan. 1846, p. 60, with portrait, 21 Feb. 1857, p. 160, and 15 Dec. 1860, pp. 563, 568; Times, 19 Feb. 1857, p. 9, and 27 Feb., p. 10; Fraser's Mag. July 1835, p. 43, with portrait; Bates's Maclise Portrait Gallery (1883), pp. 323–5, with portrait; Doyle's Official Baronage, i. 679, with portrait; J. Evans's Lancashire Authors (1850), pp. 85–8; Quarterly Journal Geological Soc. of London, xiv. pp. xlv–xlvii (1858); Proceedings Royal Geographical Society of London, 25 May 1857, pp. 377–83; St. Vincent Beechy's Sermons on Death of Earl of Ellesmere (1857).] G. C. B.

EGERTON, FRANCIS HENRY, eighth Earl of Bridgewater (1756–1829), founder of the 'Bridgewater Treatises,' younger son of John Egerton, bishop of Durham [q. v.], by Lady Anne Sophia Grey, daughter of Henry, duke of Kent, was born in London on 11 Nov. 1756, and educated at Eton and at Christ Church and All Souls' College, Oxford. He matriculated at Christ Church on 27 March 1773, proceeded B.A. on 23 Oct. 1776, and M.A. on 24 May 1780. In 1780, also, he was elected fellow of All Souls, and appointed (30 Nov.) prebendary of Durham. In the following year he was presented by the Duke of Bridgewater to the rectory of Middle, and in 1797 to that of Whitchurch, both in Shropshire. He retained the preferments till his death, but for many years their duties were performed by proxy. He was elected F.R.S. in 1781 and F.S.A. in 1791, and was a prince of the Holy Roman Empire. In January 1808 he and his sister Amelia were raised to the rank of earl's children, and on 21 Oct. 1823 he succeeded his brother John William as Earl of Bridgewater, Viscount Brackley, and Baron Ellesmere.

He was a good scholar, a lover of litera-

ture and antiquities, and a patron of learning, but was withal a man of great eccentricity. He lived for many of his later years at Paris, in a mansion he called the Hôtel Egerton, in Rue St. Honoré. His house was filled with cats and dogs, some of which were dressed up as men and women, and were driven out in his carriage, and fed at his table. In his last feeble days he stocked his garden with large numbers of rabbits, and with pigeons and partridges with clipped wings, in order to enjoy the 'sport' of killing a few heads of game for his table.

His literary works were chiefly printed for private circulation. From some of them it is evident that he regarded his ancestry with the greatest pride, while they also show that he lived in unhappy discord with his contemporary relations. He printed the following: 1. 'Life of Thomas Egerton, Lord High Chancellor of England' (reprinted from vol. v. of Kippis's 'Biographia Britannica'), 1793, 20 pages, enlarged to 57 pages 1798, further enlarged to 91 pages 1801, fol., again in 1812 (Paris, fol.), and finally in 1816 (Paris, 4to). The last contains voluminous important letters and historical documents, which have, however, no bearing whatever on the life of Egerton, and are printed without order or method. It was printed to p. 62 by Mame in 1816, and as far as p. 508 by other printers, but was never completed. 2. 'Life of John Egerton, Bishop of Durham.' Contributed to Hutchinson's 'Durham,' vol. iii., 1794, and reprinted several times subsequently, with portrait. 3. 'Εὐριπίδου Ἱππόλυτος Στεφανηφόρος cum Scholiis,' Oxford, 1796, 4to. 4. 'Description of the Inclined Plane executed by Francis Egerton, third Duke of Bridgewater, at Walkden Moor,' originally printed in 'Trans. Soc. of Arts,' afterwards in a French translation, 1803, and in other languages. 5. 'Aperçu Historique et Généalogique' (on the Egerton family, by F. Hargrave, dated 1807), Paris, 4to, and 1817, 8vo. 6. 'John Bull' (an anonymous political pamphlet), Lond. 1808, 8vo. 7. 'Character of Francis Egerton, third Duke of Bridgewater,' Lond. 1809, 4to, reprinted at Paris, with portrait. 8. Translation of Milton's 'Comus' in Italian and French, with notes, Paris, 1812, 4to. 9. 'Lettre Inédite de la Seigneurie de Florence au Pape Sixte IV, 21 Juillet 1478' (with notes), Paris, 1814, 4to, and 1817, 8vo. 10. 'A Fragment of an Ode of Sappho, from Longinus; also an Ode of Sappho from Dionysius Halicarn.,' Paris, 1815, 8vo. 11. 'Extrait avec additions du No. 44 du Monthly Repertory,' Paris, n. d., 8vo; also 1817. 12. 'Four Letters from Spa in May 1819, to John William Egerton, Earl of Bridgewater,' Lond., 8vo. 13. Letters (about seven) to the same in 1820 and 1821, Lond. 8vo. 14. 'A Letter to the Parisians and the French Nation upon Inland Navigation, containing a Defence of the Public Character of his Grace Francis Egerton, late Duke of Bridgewater, and including some notices and anecdotes concerning Mr. James Brindley,' Paris, 1819. Also the second part, Paris, 1820, 8vo. There is a French translation. A third part was printed, but not circulated. 15. 'Note C, indicated at p. 113 in the Third Part of a Letter on Inland Navigation,' Paris (1823?), 8vo, being observations on the Book of Job, &c. 16. 'Numbers ix. x. xi. xii. xiii. of Addenda and Corrigenda to the Edition of the Hippolytus Stephanéphorus of Euripides,' Paris, 1822, 4to. These notes, which are printed in a most eccentric manner, have little or no relation to the text. 17. 'An Address to the People of England,' Paris, 1826, 8vo. 18. 'Family Anecdotes,' Paris, 4to and 8vo. Extracts from this book are given in the 'Literary Gazette,' 1827. 19. A catalogue (of his printed and manuscript works), Paris, 4to. 20. 'A Treatise on Natural Theology,' printed by Didot, Paris, but not finished. He issued a series of engraved plans of his Paris house, and several portraits of members of his family, one of which is inscribed 'Sophia Egerton, natural daughter of Francis Henry Egerton, Earl of Bridgewater, educated at Mme. Campan's.'

He died unmarried at his residence in Paris on 11 Feb. 1829, aged 72; and his remains were brought to England and buried at Little Gaddesden, Hertfordshire, near the family seat, Ashridge. With him died all his titles.

By his will, dated 25 Feb. 1825, he bequeathed 8,000*l.* for the best work on 'The Goodness of God as manifested in the Creation.' The disposal of this money was left to the president of the Royal Society, who divided it among eight persons—Dr. Chalmers, Dr. Kidd, Dr. Whewell, Sir C. Bell, P. M. Roget, Dean Buckland, Rev. W. Kirby, and Dr. Prout—as authors of eight essays, since known as the 'Bridgewater Treatises.'

His valuable collection of manuscripts and autographs he left to the British Museum, with a sum of 12,000*l.*, of which the interest was partly for the custodian and partly for the augmentation of the collection. The 'Egerton Manuscripts,' as they are called, relate chiefly to the history and literature of France and Italy. The funds of the collection were increased in 1838 by Lord Farnborough.

[Gent. Mag. 1829, vol. xcix. pt. i. p. 558; Edwards's Founders of the Brit. Mus. 1870, p. 446; Complete Peerage, by G. E. C. (i.e. Cokayne), p. 23

in the Genealogist, April 1887; Doyle's Official Baronage, i. 230; Sims's Handbook to the Brit. Mus. p. 47; Le Neve's Fasti (Hardy), iii. 312; Cat. of Oxford Graduates; Cussans's Hertfordshire, Hundred of Dracorum, p. 140; Querard's La France Littéraire, iii. 11, vi. 146; Allibone's Dict. of Authors, i. 245; Brit. Mus. Cat.]

C. W. S.

EGERTON, JOHN, first EARL OF BRIDGEWATER (1579–1649), born in 1579, was the second but only surviving son of Sir Thomas Egerton, lord Ellesmere [q. v.], by his first wife, Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Ravenscroft, esq., of Bretton, Flintshire. He went to Ireland in Essex's expedition of 1599 with his elder brother Thomas, who was killed there. He was baron of the exchequer of Chester from 25 Feb. 1598–9 till 21 Feb. 1604–5 in succession to his brother, and was M.P. for Shropshire in 1601. His father's position at Elizabeth's court caused the young man to be made a knight of the Bath on James I's arrival in England (24 July 1603), and he went to Oxford with the royal party in 1605, when he received the honorary degree of M.A. His father's letters suggest that he was seriously ill in 1603 and permanently lame (*Egerton Papers*, pp. 362, 365). On his father's death, 15 March 1616–17, he became second Viscount Brackley, and on 27 May following was promoted to the earldom of Bridgewater in accordance with James I's promise to his father. Buckingham is reported to have extorted 20,000*l.* from the new earl as the price of the honour. About the same time he became a member of the council of Wales. He married Frances Stanley, daughter and coheiress of Ferdinando, earl of Derby. The lady's mother was his father's third wife. Bridgewater and his wife lived at Ashridge in the parish of Little Gaddesden, Hertfordshire, about sixteen miles from his father's house at Harefield, where his stepmother, who was also his wife's mother, long resided after her husband's death. About 1634 the earl's children took part in the first performance of Milton's 'Arcades' at Harefield. Bridgewater became a privy councillor on 4 July 1626, and on 26 June 1631 was nominated president of the council of Wales, with an official residence at Ludlow Castle, Shropshire. He became lord-lieutenant of the counties on the Welsh border and of North and South Wales 8 July 1631. Bridgewater first went to Wales on 12 May 1633, and it was not till the autumn of the next year that he made his public entrance into the Principality. Great festivities were held at Ludlow, where an elaborate series of instructions was signed by Charles I at Theobald's (RYMER, *Fœdera*, xix. 449–65). Milton's 'Comus' was written for the occasion, and was first acted at Ludlow Castle 29 Sept. 1634 by the earl's children [see EGERTON, JOHN, second EARL OF BRIDGEWATER]. Many of the earl's official letters written in Wales are preserved in the Record Office.

Bridgewater lived a very retired life after the civil wars broke out. He was joint-commissioner of array for Flintshire, Denbighshire, and Merionethshire in May 1643, but soon afterwards withdrew to his house at Ashridge, where he died on 4 Dec. 1649. He was buried in the neighbouring church of Little Gaddesden, where a laudatory inscription records numberless virtues.

Bridgewater had literary tastes and improved the library left him by his father. One R. C. dedicated to him, in an elaborate poem, a translation of Seneca (Lond. 1635). Bridgewater's autograph is reproduced in Collier's 'Bridgewater Catalogue,' p. 322, from a copy in the Bridgewater Library of John Vicars's 'Babel's Balm' (1624), which is also dedicated to Bridgewater.

By his wife, Frances, daughter and coheiress of Ferdinando Stanley, earl of Derby, Bridgewater had four sons and eleven daughters. Two sons, James and Charles, died young, and two, John [q. v.] and Charles, survived him. Of his daughters, one named Alice and another Anne died young, and Cecilia did not marry. Frances was wife of Sir John Hobart of Blickling, Norfolk; Arabella married Oliver, lord St. John, son of the Earl of Bolingbroke; Elizabeth married David, son of Sir Richard Cecil; Mary married Richard, son of Edward, lord Herbert of Cherbury; Penelope married Sir Robert Napier of Luton; Catherine was wife of William, son of Sir William Courten [q. v.]; Magdalen married Sir Gervase Cutler, and Alice Richard Vaughan, earl of Carberry. The Countess of Bridgewater died 11 March 1635–6.

[Dugdale's Baronage, ii. 415; Collins's Peerage, ii. 232–5; Doyle's Baronage, i. 224–5; Masson's Life of Milton, i. 552 et seq.; Gardiner's Hist. of England; Egerton Papers (Camd. Soc.), 1840; Clutterbuck's Hertfordshire; R. H. C[live]'s Documents connected with the History of Ludlow and the Lords Marchers (1841), pp. 182–3; Cal. State Papers (Dom.) 1633–43.]

S. L. L.

EGERTON, JOHN, second EARL OF BRIDGWATER (1622–1686), was the third but eldest surviving son of the first earl [q. v.] At the age of twelve, when Viscount Brackley, he and his younger brother, Mr. Thomas Egerton, were among the 'ten young lords and noblemen's sons' associated with the king himself in the performance of Carew's masque, 'Cœlum Britannicum,' 18 Feb. 1634

(Warton, p. 114; Masson, i. 550–1). When in the same year, as Professor Masson supposes, Milton's 'Arcades' was 'presented' to the Countess Dowager of Derby, Lady Bridgewater's mother, at Harefield, some sixteen miles from Ashridge, Lord Bridgewater's Hertfordshire seat and country house, Brackley and his brother were probably (Warton, *ib.*; Masson, i. 562; Todd, v. 154) among the 'some noble persons of her family' who sang and spoke Milton's words to their grandmother, the Dowager Lady Derby. His sisters were pupils of Henry Lawes [q. v.], who is supposed to have written what little music was required for the 'Arcades.' Undoubtedly Brackley represented the Elder Brother, Mr. Thomas Egerton the Second Brother, and their sister, Lady Alice Egerton, The Lady in 'Comus,' which, with Lawes as the Attendant Spirit, was performed in the great hall of Ludlow Castle on Michaelmas night 1634. 'A manuscript of Oldys' is Warton's sole authority (p. 133 *n.*) for the well-known statement in which the plot of 'Comus' is described as suggested by the incident that Brackley with his brother and sister had been benighted in a wood near Harefield, their grandmother's house. The first edition of 'Comus,' published in 1637, without the author's name, was dedicated by Lawes to Brackley.

In 1642 Brackley married Elizabeth, daughter of William, then Earl, afterwards Marquis and Duke of Newcastle, a very devout lady, to whom he seems to have been always passionately attached. In 1649 he succeeded his father as Earl of Bridgewater. As a royalist, suspected of conspiring against the Commonwealth, he was arrested, imprisoned, and examined in April 1651, but was soon released on bail, giving his own bond for 10,000*l.* and finding two sureties in 5,000*l.* to appear before the council of state when called on, and 'not to do anything prejudicial to the present government' (*Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1651, p. 162). In the same year was issued Milton's 'Pro populo Anglicano Defensio.' Bridgewater possessed a copy of it, on the title-page of which he wrote the words 'Liber igne, author furcâ dignissimi' (Todd, i. 127 *n.*). After the Restoration he was appointed in 1662, with Clarendon and the Bishop of London, to manage the conference between the two houses upon the Act of Uniformity. On 14 May 1663 he was chosen high steward of Oxford University, which the same day conferred on him the degree of M.A. In the following month, Bridgewater having accepted a challenge from the Earl of Middlesex, both of them were ordered into custody, when he was joined by his wife, who before he was liberated died in childbed, a loss from which, according to his epitaph on her, he never recovered. On 13 Feb. 1666 he was sworn of the privy council, and in 1667 he was appointed one of the commissioners to inquire into the expenditure of the money voted by parliament for the Dutch war, and in 1672 he was elected high steward of Wycombe. In 1673 Milton issued the second edition of his minor poems, in which for obvious reasons he did not reprint Lawes's dedication of 'Comus' to the Viscount Brackley of 1637. In the House of Peers Bridgewater seems to have generally acted with the country party. In 1679 he was sworn of the new privy council, consisting of members of both the court and country parties, appointed at Sir William Temple's suggestion. He died 26 Oct. 1686, and was buried in the church of Little Gaddesden. Sir Henry Chauncy, the historian of Hertfordshire, who knew him, describes him as 'adorned with a modest and grave aspect, a sweet and pleasant countenance, a comely presence,' as 'a learned man' who 'delighted much in his library,' and further as possessed of all the virtues. He is said to have been a liberal patron of works of learning, and among them of Pole's 'Synopsis Critica.' In Todd's 'Ashridge' is printed a series of instructions drawn up by the earl for the management of his household, which is interesting from its detailed account of the organisation of an English nobleman's establishment in the second half of the seventeenth century. No. 607 of the Egerton MSS., Brit. Mus., is a transcript of his wife's prayers and meditations, with his autograph note, 'Examined by J. Bridgewater.'

[H. J. Todd's third edition of Milton's Poetical Works, 1826, vol. i.; Some Account of the Life and Writings of Milton, and v. 209, &c., Preliminary Notes on Comus; Thomas Warton's edition of Milton's Minor Poems, 1785; Masson's Life of Milton, 1859; Todd's Hist. of the College of Bonhommes at Ashridge, 1823; Sir Henry Chauncy's Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire, 1700.] F. E.

EGERTON, JOHN, third Earl of Bridgewater (1646–1701), was the eldest surviving son of the second earl [q. v.], by his wife, the Lady Elizabeth Cavendish, daughter of the first Duke of Newcastle. Born 9 Nov. 1646, he was made one of the knights of the Bath at the coronation of Charles II; and in the parliament called by James II he was returned as one of the knights for Buckinghamshire, sitting by his courtesy title of Viscount Brackley. In 1686 he succeeded his father in the peerage, and in the follow-

ing year King James removed him from the lord-lieutenancy of Buckinghamshire, as he was then counted among the disaffected peers. At the Revolution of 1688 Bridgewater concurred in the vote of the House of Lords for settling the crown on the Prince and Princess of Orange. Upon his accession William III reconstituted the earl lord-lieutenant of Buckinghamshire. He was also sworn a member of the privy council, and appointed first commissioner of trade and the plantations. In March 1694–5 Bridgewater bore one of the banners of England and France at the funeral of Queen Mary. On 31 May 1699 he was nominated first commissioner for executing the office of lord high admiral of England; and on 1 June following he was appointed one of the lords justices of the kingdom during the king's absence beyond the seas, being subsequently confirmed in the office. Bridgewater was a man of excellent character, and well proved in the public business. He presided in the House of Lords, during the absence of Lord-chancellor Somers, on the occasion of the important debates on the Resumption Bill. On several occasions he prorogued parliament at the command of the king. He stood high in his sovereign's confidence, and died during his tenure of office as first lord of the admiralty, 19 March 1700–1. He was much lamented as 'a just and good man, a faithful friend, and a wise counsellor.' He married first, Elizabeth, daughter of the Earl of Middlesex (who died in 1670); and secondly, Jane, eldest daughter of the Duke of Bolton. He was succeeded in the earldom by his third son, Scroop Egerton, who, after holding important posts in the state, was created Duke of Bridgewater, 18 June 1720. It was this duke who first conceived the idea of the great Bridgewater canal, and he obtained the first of the acts for putting the project in force.

[Collins's Peerage of England, ed. Brydges, vol. iii., 1812; Macaulay's Hist. of England, vol. v.] G. B. S.

EGERTON, JOHN (1721–1787), bishop of Durham, son of Henry Egerton, bishop of Hereford, by Lady Elizabeth Ariana Bentinck, daughter of the Earl of Portland, was born in London on 30 Nov. 1721, and educated at Eton and at Oriel College, Oxford, where he was admitted a gentleman commoner on 20 May 1740. He was ordained deacon and priest by Hoadly, bishop of Winchester, on 21 and 22 Dec. 1745, and on the 23rd of the same month was collated by his father to the rectory of Ross, Herefordshire, and on 3 Jan. following to the prebend of Cublington in Hereford Cathedral. He took the degree of B.C.L. at Oxford on 30 May 1746, was appointed king's chaplain 19 March 1749, and dean of Hereford 24 July 1750. On 4 July 1756 he was consecrated bishop of Bangor, having previously received the degree of D.C.L. He continued to hold, *in commendam*, the rectory of Ross and the prebend of Cublington. He was translated to the see of Lichfield and Coventry on 12 Oct. 1768, and a few days afterwards was admitted to the prebend of Wildland, and a residentiaryship in St. Paul's Cathedral, London. On 8 July 1771 he succeeded Dr. Trevor as bishop of Durham. He had previously declined the primacy of Ireland. At Durham he displayed much address and talent for conciliation in promoting the peace and prosperity of the palatinate. He restored harmony in the county, which had been divided by elections, and in the city, which had been torn to pieces by disputes. In the discharge of his episcopal functions he was diligent, conscientious, just, and dignified; and in private life was amiable, hospitable, and scholar-like. He was a great benefactor to the county by encouraging public works. He promoted the enclosure of Walling Fen in Howdenshire; assisted materially in rebuilding a bridge over the Tyne between Newcastle and Gateshead, and in 1780 granted a new charter, restoring ancient and affording new privileges, to the city of Durham. He also obtained acts of parliament to relieve a large body of copyholders at Lanchester, Hamsteel Fell, and in the manor of Howdenshire, from certain onerous dues. He made extensive improvements at the episcopal palaces, and was a liberal supporter of many religious and educational institutions.

His first wife was Lady Anne Sophia, daughter of Henry de Grey, duke of Kent, whom he married on 21 Nov. 1748, and who died in 1780. By her he had issue a daughter and three sons. The first son died in infancy, and the others, John William and Francis Henry [q. v.], both succeeded to the earldom of Bridgewater. He married secondly, on 31 March 1782, Mary, sister of Sir Edward Boughton, bart.

His only publications were three single sermons, 1757, 1761, and 1763. He died at his house in Grosvenor Square, London, on 18 Jan. 1787, and was buried in St. James's Church.

[Memoir by his son, H. F. Egerton, in Hutchinson's Hist. of Durham, vol. iii., the same subsequently reprinted by the author; Collins's Peerage (Brydges), 1812, iii. 217; Chalmers's Biog. Dict. xiii. 82; Surtees's Hist. of Durham, i. cxxiii; Le Neve's Fasti (Hardy); Nichols's Illustr. of Lit. i. 456; Burke's Patrician, i. 274

(where a curious circumstance connected with the registration of the bishop's first marriage is narrated); Brit. Mus. Cat. of Printed Books, sub nom.; Evans's Cat. of Portraits, i. 111.]

C. W. S.

EGERTON, Sir PHILIP de MALPAS GREY- (1806–1881), palæontologist, the eldest son of the Rev. Sir Philip Grey-Egerton, ninth baronet, of Oulton Park, Tarporley, Cheshire, was born on 13 Nov. 1806. He was educated at Eton and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1828. While an undergraduate Egerton was attracted to geology, which he studied under Buckland and Conybeare; and in conjunction with his college friend Viscount Cole (afterwards Earl of Enniskillen) he devoted himself to the collection of fossil fishes. The friends travelled together over Germany, Switzerland, and Italy in pursuit of this object, and accumulated many specimens of unique value. In 1830 Egerton was elected member of parliament for Chester as a tory. He unsuccessfully contested the southern division of the county in 1832, but was successful in 1835, and continuously represented the division until 1868, when he was elected for West Cheshire, which he represented till his death. While sedulously discharging his duties as a member, especially on committees, he never ceased to add to his collection of fossil fishes. Many of the fishes described in Agassiz's great monographs, and in the 'Decades of the Geological Survey of Great Britain,' belonged to the Egerton collection. Egerton himself contributed the descriptions in the sixth, eighth, and ninth 'Decades.' He was elected fellow of the Geological Society in 1829, and of the Royal Society in 1831, and was awarded the Wollaston medal of the Geological Society in 1873. In 1879 the Chester Society of Natural Science gave Egerton the first Kingsley medal for his services to the society and to the literature and history of the county. He served science assiduously for many years as a member of the councils of the Royal and Geological societies, a trustee of the British Museum and of the Royal College of Surgeons, and as a member of the senate of the university of London. He died in London on 5 April 1881, after a very brief illness. He married in 1832 Anna Elizabeth, the second daughter of Mr. G. J. Legh of High Legh, Cheshire, by whom he left two sons and two daughters. His elder son, Philip le Belward, succeeded to the baronetcy. Lady Egerton died in 1882. Egerton's funeral was, by his own request, extremely simple, and after expressing his wishes he concluded his instructions thus: 'I trust in God's mercy, through Jesus Christ, that the occasion may be one of rejoicing rather than of mourning.'

Egerton was not merely a collector but a careful scientific observer, and a good naturalist. He had also great business ability and good judgment, and was of a genial and kindly disposition, which made him very popular with political opponents. His collection of fossil fishes, as well as that of Lord Enniskillen, has been acquired for the British Museum of Natural History, South Kensington.

Egerton published several catalogues of his collection of fossil fishes. A catalogue published in 1837 was in quarto, and includes references to the published figures and descriptions. In 1871 an octavo catalogue was published entitled 'Alphabetical Catalogue of Type Specimens of Fossil Fishes.' Egerton also edited several memoirs published by the Camden Society (vols. xxxix. and xl.) and the Chetham Society (vol. lxxxiii.), and also published 'Papers relating to Elections of Knights of the Shire for the County Palatine of Chester, from the Death of Oliver Cromwell to the Accession of Queen Anne,' Chester, 1852, and 'A Short Account of the Possessors of Oulton, from the Acquisition of the Property by Marriage with the Done, until the Accession to the Baronetcy on the Death of Thomas, first Earl of Wilton,' London, 1869, 4to, for private distribution.

Over eighty memoirs or short papers, chiefly relating to fossil fishes, were contributed by Egerton to the 'Transactions,' 'Proceedings,' and 'Journal of the Geological Society' and other scientific journals, from 1833 onwards; a list of them will be found in the 'Royal Society's Catalogue of Scientific Papers.'

[Chester Chronicle, 9 April 1881; Nature, 21 April 1881; Quarterly Journal of the Geological Soc., 1882, xxxviii. 46–8; Proc. Royal Society, xxxiii. 1882, xxii–iv.] G. T. B.

EGERTON, SARAH (1782–1847), actress, was the daughter of the Rev. Peter Fisher, rector of Little Torrington, Devonshire. After the death (1803) of her father she took to the stage, appearing at the Bath theatre on 3 Dec. 1803 as Emma in 'The Marriage Promise' of John Till Allingham. Here she remained for six or seven years, playing as a rule secondary characters. Her last benefit at Bath took place on 21 March 1809, when she played Gunilda in Dimond's 'Hero of the North' and Emmeline in Hawkesworth's 'Edgar and Emmeline.' She probably married Daniel Egerton [q. v.] soon afterwards. He was playing leading business in Bath. Her first recorded appearance as Mrs. Egerton was at Birmingham in 1810. On

25 Feb. 1811, as Mrs. Egerton from Birmingham, she played Juliet at Covent Garden with no very conspicuous success. Marcia in 'Cato,' Luciana in 'Comedy of Errors,' Emilia in 'Othello' followed during the same season. She could not struggle against the formidable opposition of Mrs. Siddons and subsequently of Miss O'Neill, and it was not until she took to melodrama that her position was assured. In the 'Miller and his Men' by Pocock she was (21 Oct. 1813) the original Ravina. Again she relapsed into obscurity, from which, in adaptations from the 'Waverley Novels,' she permanently issued. 'Guy Mannering, or the Gipsy's Prophecy,' by Daniel Terry, was produced at Covent Garden on 12 March 1816. John Emery [q. v.] was originally cast for Meg Merrilies, but refused positively to take the part. Under these circumstances the management turned almost in despair to Mrs. Egerton, whose success proved to be conspicuous. Helen Macgregor in Pocock's 'Rob Roy Macgregor, or Auld Lang Syne,' 12 March 1818, followed. Her services having been dispensed with at Covent Garden, she played (13 Jan. 1819), at the Surrey, Madge Wildfire in Thomas Dibdin's 'The Heart of Midlothian, or the Lily of St. Leonard's,' and subsequently Young Norval in Home's 'Douglas,' played as a melodrama. In 1819–1820 she appeared at Drury Lane, then under Elliston's management, as Meg Merrilies, playing during this and the following seasons in tragedy and melodrama and even in comedy. She was the Queen to Kean's Hamlet, and appeared as Clementina Allspice in 'The Way to get Married,' Volumnia in 'Coriolanus,' Jane de Montfort in the alteration of Joanna Baillie's 'De Montfort,' brought forward for Kean 27 Nov. 1821, Alicia in 'Jane Shore,' and many other characters. When, in 1821, her husband took Sadler's Wells, she appeared with conspicuous success as Joan of Arc in Fitzball's drama of that name. Subsequently she played in melodrama at the Olympic, also under her husband's management. Soon after Egerton's death in 1835 she retired from the stage, accepting a pension from the Covent Garden Fund. She died at Chelsea on 3 Aug. 1847, and was buried on 7 Aug. in Chelsea churchyard. A third-rate actress in tragedy, she approached the first rank in melodrama. Macready (*Reminiscences*, i. 125) says 'her merits were confined to melodrama.'

[Books cited; Genest's Account of the Stage; Mrs. Baron Wilson's Our Actresses; New Monthly Mag.; Theatrical Biog. 1824; Thomas Dibdin's Reminiscences; Era Almanack, 1871, 1873; Era newspaper, 15 Aug. 1847; Theatrical Inquisitor, various years.] J. K.

EGERTON, STEPHEN (1555?–1621?), puritan divine, was born in London about 1555. He became a member of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, and earned so great a reputation for learning that a fellowship was only denied him on account of the poverty of his college. He took the M.A. degree in 1579, and on 9 July 1583 was incorporated at Oxford. He had already taken orders and attached himself to the puritan party, being one of the leaders in the formation of the presbytery at Wandsworth, Surrey, which has been described as the first presbyterian church in England. In 1584 he was suspended for refusing to subscribe to Whitgift's articles, but he does not appear to have remained long under censure, for shortly afterwards he was active in promoting the 'Book of Discipline,' and was one of those nominated by the puritan synod to superintend the proper performance of its articles. During the imprisonment of Barrow and Greenwood in 1590 Egerton was sent by the Bishop of London to confer with them, and several letters passed between him and them; but later in the same year he himself was summoned, together with several other ministers, before the high commission, and was committed to the Fleet prison, where he remained about three years. In 1598 he became minister of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, London. He was one of those chosen to present the millenary petition for the further reform of the church in 1603, and in May of the following year he introduced a petition to the lower house of convocation for the reformation of the prayer-book. He remained in his cure at Blackfriars till his death, which took place about 1621, being assisted in his latter years by William Googe, who succeeded him. He was described by Dr. Nowell, in a letter, as a 'man of great learning and godliness.'

Egerton published several sermons, few of which remain. Chief among those of his works still extant are 'A Brief Method of Catechising,' first issued in 1594, which in 1644 reached a forty-fourth edition; and a translation from the French of Matthew Virel entitled 'A Learned and Excellent Treatise containing all principal Grounds of the Christian Religion,' the earliest edition of which now remaining is the fourth, published in 1597, and the latest the fourteenth in 1635. Egerton's preface to this book contains some well-chosen and sensible remarks on the choice of reading. In addition to his own books he wrote introductions for several publications by his fellow-puritans, including Rogers, Pricke, Baine, and Byfield.

[Brook's Lives of the Puritans, ii. 289; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ed. Bliss, i. 224; Strype's Annals

of the Reformation, ii. pt. ii. 198, iii. pt. i. 691, iv. 553; Newcourt's Repert. Eccl. Lond. i. 915; Wilson's Hist. of Dissenting Churches, i. 11.]

A. V.

EGERTON, Sir THOMAS, Baron Ellesmere and Viscount Brackley (1540?–1617), lord chancellor, born about 1540, was the natural son of Sir Richard Egerton of Ridley, Cheshire, by one Alice Sparke. His father's family claimed descent from Robert Fitzhugh, baron of Malpas, a contemporary of William I. He is stated to have become a commoner of Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1556, but his name is absent from the matriculation register. He entered Lincoln's Inn three years later; was called to the bar in 1572; quickly acquired a large practice in the chancery courts, and was rapidly promoted. In 1580 he was governor of his inn, in 1582 Lent reader, and in 1587 treasurer. He became solicitor-general on 26 June 1581, and attorney-general on 2 June 1592. He was knighted at the close of 1593, and was appointed chamberlain of Chester. It is stated that the queen conferred the solicitorship after hearing him plead in a case in which he opposed the crown. 'In my troth,' she is said to have exclaimed, 'he shall never plead against me again.' He conducted the prosecutions of Campion in 1581, of Davison in 1587, of the Earl of Arundel in 1589, and of Sir John Perrot in 1592. On 10 April 1594 Egerton was promoted to the bench as master of the rolls, and after Sir John Puckering's death he became lord keeper on 6 May 1596. The last promotion, like the first, was conferred on him by the queen's 'own choice without any competitor or mediator.' Burghley was ill pleased by Elizabeth's independent action, but the popular verdict was highly favourable to the appointment. 'I think no man,' wrote Reynolds to Essex, 'ever came to this dignity with more applause than this worthy gentleman' (Birch, *Memoirs*, i. 479). Egerton was made at the same time a privy councillor, and continued to hold the mastership of the rolls till 18 May 1603. Elizabeth consulted him repeatedly in matters of home and foreign policy. In 1598 he was a commissioner for treating with the Dutch, and in 1600 was similarly employed with Denmark. As lord keeper he delivered the queen's messages to parliament, and announced her temporising decision respecting monopolies on 9 Feb. 1597–8. In November 1601 he came into collision with the speaker of the House of Commons on a small question of procedure, and was compelled to withdraw from the position that he first took up. His consideration for deserving young barristers is illustrated by the invariable kindness which he showed to Francis Bacon, who acknowledged his 'fatherly care' when writing of him in 1596. In 1606 Egerton worked hard to secure the attorney-generalship for Bacon, but although he met with no success, his openly displayed patronage was of assistance to Bacon at the bar.

Egerton made the acquaintance of the Earl of Essex [see Devereux, Robert, 1567–1601] soon after coming to court, and in spite of the disparity in their ages a warm friendship sprang up between them. 'They love and join very honourably together,' wrote Anthony Bacon to Dr. Hawkins (Birch, ii. 146). Egerton was one of the few councillors who witnessed the famous scene in the council, in July 1598, when Essex insulted the queen and she boxed his ears. Afterwards in well-reasoned letters Egerton earnestly urged upon Essex the obvious prudence of a humble apology to Elizabeth. While Essex was in Ireland in the autumn of 1599, Egerton sent the earl a timely warning that his policy was exciting suspicion and dissatisfaction at home. When Essex arrived home without leave, he was committed to the custody of the lord keeper on 1 Oct. 1599, and lived in York House, the lord keeper's official residence, till 5 July 1600. A month earlier he was brought before a specially constituted court, meeting in York House, over which Egerton presided, and was then deprived of all his offices. On the morning of Sunday, 8 Feb. 1600–1, the day fixed by Essex for his rebellion, Egerton, with three other officers of state, went to Essex's house to request an explanation of his suspicious conduct. They were allowed to enter, and cries of 'Kill them' were raised by Essex's armed supporters. Essex led them to a back room, and locked the door upon them. They were released at four o'clock in the afternoon, after six hours' detention, when the failure of Essex's rebellion was known. Egerton took a prominent part in Essex's trial on 19 Feb. 1600–1.

The queen's confidence in her lord keeper increased with her years. He was an active member of all special commissions. From 31 July to 3 Aug. 1602 he entertained the queen at enormous expense for three days at his house at Harefield, Middlesex (*Egerton Papers*, 340–57). He had bought this estate of Sir Edmund Anderson in 1601. With James I Egerton was soon on equally good terms. On 26 March 1603, two days after the queen's death, the Earl of Northumberland declared that the privy councillors had no authority to act in the interregnum, and that the old nobility should fill their places. Egerton acquiesced so far as to suggest that

privy councillors who were not peers should surrender their seats at the head of the council table to those councillors who were. On 5 April 1603 James, while still in Scotland, reappointed Egerton lord keeper, and Egerton met the king on his journey into England at Broxbourne on 3 May. Sixteen days later he resigned the office of master of the rolls to Edward Bruce, lord Kinross. On 19 July, when he received from the king the new great seal, he was made Baron Ellesmere, and on the 24th lord chancellor. Ellesmere proved subservient to James. He adopted James's hostile attitude to the puritans at the Hampton Court conference in 1604, and declared that the king's speech then first taught him the meaning of the phrase, 'Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote.' On 9 Feb. 1604–5 he expressed resentment at a petition from Northamptonshire demanding the restitution of deprived puritan ministers, and obtained from the Star-chamber a declaration that the deprivation was lawful, and the presentation of the petition unlawful. Three days later he directed the judges to enforce the penal laws against the catholics. Ellesmere helped to determine the Act of Union of England and Scotland in 1606 and 1607. In June 1608 a case of great importance affecting the relations between the two countries was decided by the chancellor and twelve judges in the exchequer chambers. Doubts had arisen as to the status in England of Scottish persons born after the accession of James I. Those born before the accession (the 'antenati') were acknowledged to be aliens. The 'postnati' claimed to be naturalised subjects and capable of holding land in England. Land had been purchased in England in 1607 on behalf of Robert Colvill or Colvin, a grandson of Lord Colvill of Culross, who was born in Edinburgh in 1605. A legal question arose, and the plea that the child was an alien and incapable of holding land in England was raised. Ellesmere decided that this plea was bad, and that the child was a natural-born subject of the king of England. Twelve of the fourteen judges concurred, and Ellesmere treated the two dissentients with scant courtesy. This judgment, the most important that Ellesmere delivered, was printed by order of the king in 1609.

In May 1613 Ellesmere took a prominent part in committing Whitelocke to the Tower for indirectly questioning the royal prerogative by denying the powers of the earl marshal's court; in July 1615 Ellesmere declined to pass the pardon which Somerset had drawn up for himself, with the aid of Sir Robert Cotton; in September 1615 he made recommendations in the council for stifling opposition in the next parliament, and acted as high steward at the trial of the Earl and Countess of Somerset for the murder of Overbury in May 1616. In the struggle between the courts of equity and common law initiated by Coke, Ellesmere successfully maintained the supremacy of his own court. When the king appealed to Ellesmere as to points of law involved in his well-known dispute with Coke in June 1616, Ellesmere obtained from Bacon a legal opinion against Coke, which he adopted. On 18 Nov. 1616, when administering the oaths to Sir Henry Montague, Coke's successor as lord chief justice, he warned the new judge against following the example of his predecessor.

On 7 Nov. 1616 Ellesmere, whose health was rapidly failing, was promoted to the title of Viscount Brackley, which Coke's friends and his enemies miscalled 'Break-law.' As early as 1613 he had pressed his resignation on the king on account of increasing infirmities; but it was not till 3 March 1616–17 that James I allowed him to retire, and even then it was stipulated that his release from office should, unless his health grew worse, only continue for two years. Egerton was at the time lying ill at York House, and the king arranged the matter while paying him a visit. As a reward of faithful service James promised him an earldom. Twelve days later (15 March) Egerton died. He was buried at Dodleston, Cheshire, on 5 April. His only surviving son John [q. v.] was created Earl of Bridgewater on 27 May following. Bacon asserted that it was by Ellesmere's own wish that he succeeded him as lord chancellor. Ellesmere was chancellor of Oxford University from 1610 till 24 Jan. 1616–17. He is said to have been the first chancellor since the Reformation who employed a chaplain in his family. Dr. John Williams [q. v.] lived with him in that capacity for many years, and Dr. John Donne [q. v.] was also at one time a member of his household. The foundations of the great library at Bridgewater House were laid by the chancellor; some of the books came to him through his third wife, the Dowager Countess of Derby, who as Alice Spencer and Lady Strange was a well-known patron of Elizabethan literature (Collier, *Cat. of Bridgewater House Library*, 1857, pref.; Masson, *Life of Milton*, i. 554–61).

Egerton married first, Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Ravenscroft, esq., of Bretton, Flintshire; secondly, Elizabeth, sister of Sir George More of Loseby, and widow both of John Polstead of Abury and of Sir John Wolley; and thirdly, in 1600, Alice, daughter of Sir John Spencer of Althorpe, and widow of Ferdinando, fifth earl of Derby. By his

first wife he was father of two sons and a daughter. The younger son John is separately noticed. The elder son Thomas went the islands' voyage in 1597; was then knighted; was baron of the exchequer of Cheshire from 1596; was killed in Ireland in August 1599, and was buried in Chester Cathedral 27 Sept. He married Elizabeth, daughter of Thomas Venables of Kinderton, Cheshire, by whom he had three daughters. The chancellor's daughter Mary was wife of Sir Francis Leigh of Newnham Regis, Warwickshire. Ellesmere had no issue by his second and third wives. His third wife, whose daughter married her stepson, John Egerton, long survived him, and continued to live at Harefield, where in 1634 Milton produced his 'Arcades.'

Egerton was highly esteemed by his contemporaries. Sir George Paule, in his 'Life of Whitgift,' 1612, mentions him as 'a loving, faithful friend to the archbishop in all his affairs,' 'a lover of learning, and most constant favourer of the clergy and church government established.' Camden mentions an anagram on his name, 'Gestat Honorem,' and gives unstinted praise to the whole of his career. Hacket, Fuller, and Anthony à Wood are equally enthusiastic. Sir John Davies credits him with all the characteristics of an ideal chancellor, and paid a compliment to his literary taste by dedicating his 'Orchestra' to him. (The dedicatory sonnet is in manuscript in a copy of the volume at Bridgewater House, and is not printed in the ordinary editions.) Although always dignified in his bearing on the bench, Bacon ascribes to him some severely sarcastic apophthegms spoken to suitors in his court. His venerable presence is said to have drawn many spectators to his court, 'in order to see and admire him' (Fuller). Literary men praised him lavishly. Ben Jonson wrote three epigrams in his honour, Samuel Daniel an epistle in verse, and Joshua Sylvester a sonnet.

Ellesmere published nothing except his judgment in the case of the 'postnati' in Colvin's case. He left to his chaplain Williams manuscript treatises on the royal prerogative, the privileges of parliament, proceedings in chancery, and the power of the Star-chamber. Williams owed, according to his biographer, whatever success he achieved as lord keeper to his diligent study of those papers (Hacket, *Life of Williams*, pp. 30–1). Williams afterwards presented them to James I. Blackstone refers to the treatise on the Star-chamber in his 'Commentaries,' iv. 267; it is now in the British Museum Harl. MS. 1226. In 1641 'The Priviledges of Prerogative of the High Court of Chancery' was issued as a work of Ellesmere. Of the other two manuscript treatises nothing is now known. It is highly doubtful whether 'Observations concerning the Office of Lord Chancellor,' 1651, and 'Lord Chancellor Egerton's Observations on Lord Coke's Reports,' edited by G. Paule about 1710, have any claim to rank as Ellesmere's productions, although they have been repeatedly treated as genuine. Engraved portraits by Simon Pass and Hole are extant.

[An elaborate life by Francis Henry Egerton, eighth earl of Bridgewater [q. v.], appears in Kippis's Biog. Brit. It was reprinted separately in 1793, and with various additions in 1798, 1801, 1812, and 1828. The Egerton Papers, edited by Mr. J. P. Collier, and published by the Camden Soc. in 1840, contain a number of the chancellor's official papers preserved at Bridgewater House. In the Miscellany of the Abbotsford Club, i. 219–225, are six of Ellesmere's letters, three to James I and three to John Murray; others appear in Cabala. See also Foss's Judges, vi. 136–52; Campbell's Lives of the Lord Chancellors, ii. 174–261; Dugdale's Baronage, ii. 414; Nichols's Progresses of Elizabeth and James I; Gardiner's Hist. of England; Collins's Peerage, ii. 225–32; Birch's Memoirs; Spedding's Life of Bacon; Chauncy's Hertfordshire; Clutterbuck's Hertfordshire; Ormerod's Cheshire; Cal. State Papers (Domestic), 1581–1617.] S. L. L.

EGG, AUGUSTUS LEOPOLD (1816–1863), subject painter, was the son of Egg the well-known gunmaker in Piccadilly, where he was born on 2 May 1816. Having mastered the first elements in drawing under Henry Sass, in Charlotte Street, Bloomsbury, he obtained admission as a student into the Royal Academy in 1836, and appeared as an exhibitor first in that institution in 1838, where he exhibited 'A Spanish Girl.' This was followed by 'Laugh when you can' in 1839, and a scene from 'Henry IV' in 1840. But his first work of importance, 'The Victim,' was exhibited at Liverpool, and subsequently was engraved in the 'Gems of European Art.' He also contributed for many years to the Society of British Artists in Suffolk Street. He suffered from a weak constitution, and during a journey in Africa, undertaken for the benefit of his health, he died at Algiers on 26 March 1863, and was buried there. Egg was elected an associate of the Royal Academy in 1848, and an academician in 1860, in which year he painted a scene from the 'Taming of the Shrew.' His portrait by Frith, engraved by J. Smyth, appeared in the 'Art Union Monthly Journal' of 1847, p. 312. Works of his best quality are: 'Queen Elizabeth discovers she is no longer young' (1848); 'Peter the Great sees Katherine for the first time' (1850); 'The Life and Death of

Buckingham' (1855); scenes from 'Esmond' (1857–8); a triptych of the 'Fate of a Faithless Wife' (1858); and 'The Night before Naseby' (1859). In the National Gallery there is a canvas, 'Scene from Le Diable Boiteux' (1844).

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Ottley's Dict. of Recent and Living Painters and Engravers; Art Union (1847), p. 312.] L. F.

EGGLESFIELD, ROBERT. [See EGLESFIELD.]

EGINTON, FRANCIS (1737–1805), painter on glass, grandson of the rector of Eckington in Worcestershire, was taught the trade of an enameller at Bilston. As a young man he was employed by Matthew Boulton [q. v.] in the Soho works. In 1764 Eginton was employed as a decorator of japanned wares, but did much work in modelling. During the next few years Boulton brought together a number of able artists at Soho, including Flaxman and Wyatt; and Eginton rapidly became a skilful worker in almost every department of decorative art. Eginton was a partner with Boulton in the production of 'mechanical paintings.' The hint for these was in all probability taken by Boulton from a process modified by Robert Laurie [q. v.] from Le Prince's 'aquatint' engravings. Eginton perfected the method and applied it to the production of coloured copies of paintings, sometimes called 'polygraphs.' More plates than one were required for each picture, and after leaving the printing-press Eginton finished them by hand. They were copies from Loutherbourg, Angelica Kauffmann, and other artists, and varied in price from 1*l.* 10*s.* to 21*l.* The largest were forty inches by fifty. They were sometimes taken for original paintings. Not many years ago some of them were pronounced by two artists to be 'oil-paintings of much merit,' and their real character was not discovered till a cleaner removed the varnish. These old 'polygraphs' were in fact nearly identical with the varnished coloured lithographs (oleographs) of the present day, the main difference being that the latter are printed from stones. Mr. (afterwards Sir) F. P. Smith, then of the Patent Museum, maintained, in a paper read before the Photographic Society of London in 1863, that some of them preserved at South Kensington were photographs of early date. The claim is quite untenable. Thomas Wedgwood [q. v.] had indeed made experiments upon copying pictures by the action of light upon nitrate of silver; but the results then obtained would be altogether incapable of producing pictures of their size and character. The claim in various forms is often repeated on behalf of the scientific circle of Birmingham, but the matter was really settled by a series of pamphlets written by M. P. W. Boulton (grandson of Boulton) in 1863–5, in which he gives an account of the whole matter. Mr. Vincent Brooks, an eminent lithographer, produced an exact imitation of the 'ground' of one of the examples exhibited at South Kensington by taking an impression from an aquatint engraved plate on paper used for transfer lithography.

The 'picture branch' of Boulton's business was discontinued as unprofitable, the loss on this and the japanning trade being over 500*l.* for 1780. The partnership between Eginton and Boulton was dissolved. Lord Dartmouth proposed to grant Eginton a government pension of 20*l.* a year, but the project was privately opposed by Boulton, and it was consequently abandoned. For the next year or two Eginton appears to have continued to work at Soho, and to have begun in 1781 to stain and paint upon glass. In 1784 he left Soho and set up in business for himself at Prospect Hill House, which stood just opposite Soho, and was not taken down till 1871.

The art of glass-painting had fallen into complete disuse. Eginton revived it and issued from his Birmingham factory a long series of works in stained glass. His first work of consequence was the arms of the knights of the Garter for two Gothic windows in the stalls in St. George's Chapel, Windsor; and among other works were the east window of Wanstead Church, the archiepiscopal chapel at Armagh, the Bishop of Derry's palace, Salisbury Cathedral (east and west windows, and ten mosaic windows), Lichfield Cathedral (east window), Babworth Church, Nottingham, Aston Church, Shuckburgh Church, the ante-chapel of Magdalen College, Oxford, &c. In the banqueting room of Arundel Castle there is a fine window by Eginton (20 ft. by 10 ft.) representing Solomon and the Queen of Sheba. He also did much work at Fonthill, including thirty-two figures of kings, knights, &c., and many windows, for which Beckford paid him 12,000*l.* Eginton sent much of his painted glass abroad, and some of his finest work is believed to be in Amsterdam. In 1791 he completed what was then considered his masterpiece, the 'Conversion of St. Paul,' for the east window of St. Paul's Church, Birmingham, for which he received the 'very inadequate sum of four hundred guineas.' Eginton works were, in fact, transparencies on glass. He was obliged to render opaque a large portion of his glass, and thus missed the characteristic beauty of the old windows. Eginton's showroom was seen by all distinguished visitors of Birmingham. Nelson, ac-

companied by Sir W. and Lady Hamilton called there on 29 Aug. 1802.

Eginton died on 25 March 1805, and was buried in Old Handsworth churchyard. His daughter married Henry Wyatt, the painter; his son, William Raphael Eginton, succeeded to his father's business, and in 1816 received the appointment of glass-stainer to Princess Charlotte. His brother, John Eginton, was celebrated as an engraver in stipple.

[Birmingham Daily Post, 25 April 1871, by W. C. Aitken, reprinted in pamphlet form; Gent. Mag. 1805, pt. i. pp. 387, 482; J. H. Powell in Timmins's Midland Hardware District, 1865; the archæological section of the Birmingham and Midland Institute possesses a photograph of Prospect Hill House; G. Wallis on Supposed Photography at Soho in 1777, Art Journal, 1866, pp. 251, 269; Nagler's Künstler-Lexikon, 1837; Smiles's Lives of the Engineers, 'Boulton' and 'Watt,' 1878; Dent's Old and New Birmingham, 1880.] W. J. H.

EGINTON, FRANCIS (1775–1823), engraver, son of John Eginton, celebrated as an engraver of stipple, and nephew of Francis Eginton [q. v.], was born in Birmingham in 1775, and died in 1823 at Meertown House, near Newport, Shropshire, aged 48. Eginton's work as an engraver was distinguished by accuracy and taste. He illustrated Shaw's 'Staffordshire,' Price's 'Histories of Hereford and Leominster,' Wheler's 'History of Stratford-on-Avon,' Bissett's 'Picturesque Birmingham Guide,' Pratt's 'Leamington Guide,' Howell's 'Shrewsbury,' and most of the topographical and historical works published in the midlands during his time. A large plate of Pont-y-Cyssyllte aqueduct was one of his most notable works. Personally Eginton is described as a 'cheerful and gentlemanly companion, and much respected.'

[Birmingham Gazette, October 1823; Gent. Mag. 1824, pt. i. p. 94.] W. J. H.

EGLESFIELD, ROBERT OF (*d.* 1349), founder of the Queen's College, Oxford, was the son of John of Eglesfield and Beatrice his wife, and grandson of Thomas of Eglesfield and Hawisia his wife (*Statutes of Queen's College*, p. 7). He was presumably a native of Eaglesfield, near Cockermouth in Cumberland, and is said to have been a bachelor of divinity of Oxford. He became chaplain to Queen Philippa and rector of Burgh, or Brough, under Stainmore in Westmoreland. He bought some buildings in the parish of St. Peter-in-the-East, Oxford, in order to provide lodging for students in the university, and for this purpose obtained a charter from Edward III, dated 18 Jan. 1340-1, which established the 'Hall of the Queen's Scholars of Oxford' (RYMER, *Fœdera*, ii. 1144, Record ed.) In the statutes which Eglesfield issued on 10 Feb. following (not March, as Mr. Maxwell Lyte gives the date), he provided for the appointment of a provost, Richard of Retteford, S.T.P. (Wood says, of Balliol College), and twelve fellows or scholars—the names are used indifferently—who were to devote themselves to the study of theology and the canon law, and to enter holy orders. After the first nominees, the fellows were to be chosen by preference from the counties of Cumberland and Westmoreland, and must already have taken a degree in arts. The scheme included further the maintenance of a number, not to exceed seventy, of poor boys who should receive instruction in the hall; as well as the performance of regular religious offices and the distribution of alms. The foundation was placed under the protection of the queen-consort and her successors as patrons, and of the archbishop of York as visitor.

Eglesfield seems to have thenceforth resided in Oxford, and is known to have taken his 'commons' with the fellows in the hall he had himself founded. He died on 31 May 1349, and was buried, according to the ordinance in his statutes, in the college chapel; Browne Willis (ap. WOOD, p. 164) states that his grave was under the altar; but the brass effigy which was long believed to be his has been found to belong to some one else, and the chapel itself was rebuilt on a different site early in the eighteenth century. A small casket, however, supposed to contain the founder's remains, was removed, probably at the time, from under the old altar to the present chapel; and such a casket was seen in the crypt by a college servant, who is still (1888) living, at the burial of Provost Collinson in 1827. Eglesfield bore, argent, three eagles displayed, two and one, gules; which are still the arms of the Queen's College. The founder's seal spells the name Eglefeld. His drinking horn, which is of uncommon size and beauty, is still preserved in the college. It is figured in Skelton's 'Oxonia Antiqua Restaurata,' plate 42 (see also p. 30), 2nd ed. 1843.

There was a Robert de Eglesfeld who had a grant made to him of the manor of Ravenwyke or Renwick, 1 Edw. III, which manor was subsequently given to Queen's College by the founder (see HUTCHINSON, *Hist. of Cumberland*, i. 212, 1794). Next year, 1328, Robert de Eglefield was elected knight of the shire for Cumberland (*Parliamentary Accounts and Papers*, 1878, xvii. 1; *Members of Parliament*, p. 83). It is therefore possible that the founder entered holy orders late in life; for if there

were two Robert Eglesfields, it is difficult to understand why the second is not named, where several are named, in the statutes of the college, especially since it was through this lay Eglesfield that it acquired the manor of Ravenwyke.

[The charter and statutes of the Queen's College are printed among the Statutes of the Colleges of Oxford, 1853. See also Anthony à Wood's History and Antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed. Gutch, Colleges and Halls, pp. 138–41; Dean Burgon's notice in H. Shaw's Arms of the Colleges of Oxford, 1855; and Mr. H. T. Riley's report printed in Hist. MSS. Comm., 2nd Rep., appendix. The writer is indebted for several valuable facts and references to the kindness of the Rev. J. R. Magrath, D.D., provost of Queen's College. On the special characteristics of Eglesfield's foundation compare H. C. Maxwell Lyte's History of the University of Oxford, pp. 147–53, 1886.] R. L. P.

EGLEY, WILLIAM (1798–1870), miniature painter, was born at Doncaster in 1798. Shortly after the boy's birth his father removed to Nottingham, and became confidential agent to the Walkers of Eastwood. The gift of a box of colours which William received in early youth strengthened his desire to be a painter. But the father destined both him and his brother Thomas for the trade of bookselling. They were received into the house of Darton, the publisher, Holborn Hill, London; but while Thomas pursued this calling to the end of his life, William, by chance visits to the exhibitions in Somerset House, cultivated and stimulated his love of painting. Without any professional teaching he succeeded in finishing two pictures, the portraits of Colonel Ogleby and of Yates, the actor, which were received and exhibited by the Royal Academy in 1824. From that time until the year before his death he was a constant exhibitor, sending in all to the Royal Academy 169 miniatures, to the British Institution two pictures, and to the Suffolk Street Gallery six. He was very successful in portraying children, with whom his genial temper made him a great favourite. He died in London on 19 March 1870, aged 72. He was twice happily married, and by his first wife left a son, William Maw Egley, who is a painter of historical subjects and a regular exhibitor.

[Art Journal, 1870, p. 303; Graves's Dict. of Artists, p. 76.] R. H.

EGLINTON, Earls of. [See Montgomerie and Seton.]

EGLISHAM, GEORGE, M.D. (*fl.* 1612–1642), a Scotch physician and poet, was introduced at the age of three to the favourable notice of James VI by the Marquis of Hamilton, who said at the time that Eglisham's father was the best friend he ever had. He was brought up with Hamilton's son (afterwards second marquis, *d.* 1625), who as long as he lived remained his friend and patron. He was sent abroad and studied at Leyden, where he probably obtained his M.D. degree. While there he engaged in a one-sided controversy with Conrad Vorst, whom he accused of atheism, and published 'Hypocrisis Apologeticæ Orationis Vorstianæ, cum secunda provocatione ad Conradum Vorstium missa; auctore Geo. Eglisemmio, Scot. Phil. et Medico Vorstium iterato Atheismi, Ethneismi, Judaismi, Turcismi, hæreseos schismati et ignorantiæ apud illustrissimos ordines accusante,' Delft, 1612. The preface to this work is dated from the Hague, 1 June 1612. Eglisham obtained leave from the authorities at Leyden to invite Vorst to a public discussion, but Vorst declined to take up the challenge. Returning to Scotland, Eglisham was appointed one of the king's personal physicians in 1616, and continued to receive many tokens of favour from James, who, according to Eglisham, 'daily augmented them in writ, in deed; and accompanied them with gifts, patents, offices' (*Prodromus Vindictæ*). But of these honours no record remains. In 1618 Eglisham published 'Duellum poeticum contendentibus G. Eglisemmio medico regio, et G. Buchanano, regio preceptore pro dignitate paraphraseos Psalmi civ.' In an elaborate dedication to the king he undertook to prove that Buchanan, who died in 1582, had been guilty of 'impiety towards God, perfidy to his prince, and tyranny to the muses.' Eglisham gave a pedantic verbal criticism of Buchanan's Latin version of the psalm in question, which he printed in full, with his own translation opposite. Included in the volume are a number of the author's short Latin poems and epigrams. Eglisham vainly appealed to the university of Paris to decide that Buchanan's version was inferior. He succeeded in attracting notice to himself, and drew from his colleague Arthur Johnston a mock 'Consilium collegii medici Parisiensis de mania G. Eglishemii,' a Latin elegiac poem republished as 'Hypermorus Medicaster;' and from his friend William Barclay a serious judgment on the question at issue, which he decided strongly in favour of Buchanan. Eglisham further published in 1626 'Prodromus Vindictæ,' a pamphlet in which he openly accused the Duke of Buckingham of having caused the deaths, by poison, of the Marquis of Hamilton and the late king, and petitioned Charles I and the parliament severally to have the duke put on his trial.

A German translation appeared the same year, but the earliest English edition known of the 'Forerunner of Revenge' bears date 1642, though a letter of the period (*Cal. of State Papers*, Dom. 1625–6, p. 337) mentions the work as an English publication, 20 May 1626. Proceedings were instituted against Eglisham and his assistants, but the former had retired to Brussels, where he remained for some years, perhaps till his death, the date and place of which are unknown. He was apparently still alive in 1642. Another letter (*ib.* 1627–8, p. 192) says that for some years Dr. Eglisham had an only companion at bed and board in Captain Herriot, a mere mountebank, adding that 'they coined double pistolets together, and yet both unhanged.' Eglisham married Elizabeth Downes on 13 Sept. 1617 'in the Clink,' and had a daughter (*ib.* 1629–1631, p. 168).

[Eglisham's works as above.] A. V.

EGMONT, Earls of. [See Percival.]

EGREMONT, Baron and Earl of. [See Wyndham.]

EHRET, GEORG DIONYSIUS (1710–1770), botanic draughtsman, born at Erfurt 9 Sept. 1710, was the son of Georg Ehret, gardener to the Prince of Baden, Durlach. He received little education, but as a boy began to draw the plants in the fine garden which his father cultivated. Dr. Trew of Nuremberg first made him aware of his talent by buying the first five hundred drawings he had made for four thousand gulden. With this sum in hand he started on his travels, but his store was soon exhausted, until at Basel he had to call his art into play for his support. Having refilled his purse, he journeyed by Montpellier, Lyons, Paris (where he was employed by Bernard de Jussieu), England, and the Netherlands. Here he fell in with Linnæus, who came to live with the Dutch banker Cliffort at Hartecamp, near Haarlem, and Ehret contributed the drawings which illustrated the fine folio published by Linnæus as 'Hortus Cliffortianus,' 1737. Ehret profited by Linnæus's advice to pay more attention to the minute parts of the flower, and they continued on friendly terms until Ehret's death. About 1740 he again came to England, finding among his patrons the Duchess of Portland, Dr. Mead, and Sir Hans Sloane. Among the books he illustrated were Browne's 'Jamaica,' 1756, and Ellis's 'Corallines,' 1755, at that time considered plants. His chief published works were 'Plantæ selectæ,' 1750, ten decades, and 'Plantæ et Papiliones selectæ,' Lond., 1748–1750. He married Susanna Kennett of Gliding, near Hambledon, Sussex, and died at Chelsea 9 Sept. 1770, leaving one son, George Philip, who died October 1786 at Watford, Hertfordshire.

Many of Ehret's drawings came into the possession of Sir Joseph Banks, and are now in the botanical department of the British Museum at Cromwell Road; they bear ample testimony to his free yet accurate draughtsmanship. Some manuscripts of his are also preserved there

The genus *Ehretia* was so named in compliment by Patrick Browne, and adopted by Linnæus.

[Pulteney's Sketches, ii. 284–93; Nagler's Neues allg. Künstler-Lexikon, iv. 91; Nouv. Biog. Gén. xv. 751; Proc. Linn. Soc. (1883-6), pp. 42–56.] B. D. J.

EINEON (*fl.* 1093), Welsh prince and warrior, son of Collwyn, played a great part in the famous legend of the conquest of Glamorgan by the Normans. His father and his elder brother Cedivor seem to have been underkings in succession of Dyved or of some part of it. In 1092 Cedivor died (*Brut y Tywysogion*, s. a. 1089, but cf. Freeman, *William Rufus*, ii. 78). His son Llewelyn and his brothers (*B. y T.*), his sons according to another account (*Annales Cambriæ*, s.a. 1089), rose in revolt against Rhys ap Tewdwr, the chief king of South Wales, but were overthrown by him at Llandydoch. These discords gave easy facilities to the Norman marchers to extend their conquests in Wales. Next year Rhys was slain by the French of Brecheiniog. The conquests of Dyved and Ceredigion immediately followed. Thus far the history is authentic, but Eineon's name does not specifically appear in it. The legend now begins. Eineon, the brother of Cedivor, fled from the triumph of Rhys at Llandydoch to Iestin, son of Gwrgan, prince of Morganwg, who was also a rebel against Rhys. Now Eineon had been previously in England, had served the king in France and other lands, and knew well both William himself and his great barons. He proposed to Iestin to bring his Norman friends to the latter's help on condition of his receiving as his wife the daughter of Iestin and as her portion the lordship of Miscin. Iestin accepted the proposal. Eineon visited his English friends at London. He persuaded Robert Fitz-Hamon, whom we know in history as lord of the honour of Gloucester, and twelve other knights to bring a great army to the aid of Iestin. Rhys was slain by them in a terrible battle near the boundaries of Brecheiniog, at Hirwaun Gwrgan. With Rhys fell the kingdom of South Wales. The Normans, having done their work

for Iestin, received their pay and returned towards London. They had hardly departed when Iestin, flushed with his triumph, treacherously refused Eineon his daughter's hand. Eineon pursued the retreating Frenchmen, explained to them his own wrongs and the general unpopularity of Iestin, and showed how easy it would be for them to conquer Iestin's dominions, since his treason to Rhys had so much disgusted the South-Wales princes that not one would afford him succour. The Normans were easily persuaded. Eineon meanwhile organised a Welsh revolt. They jointly spoiled Iestin and Morganwg, but the Normans took the rich vale for their own share and left Eineon only the mountains of Senghenydd and Miscin, while the sons of Iestin were rewarded for their acquiescence in their father's fate by the lowland lordship of Aberavon. Induced by the victory of Fitz-Hamon, other Normans seized upon Dyved, Ceredigion, Brecheiniog. Thus the treachery of Eineon put all South Wales into the hands of the foreigner.

This full and elaborate story is first found in the 'Brut y Tywysogion,' first printed in the second volume of the 'Myvyrian Archaiology,' and afterwards with a translation by Mr. Aneurin Owen for the Cambrian Archæological Association in 1863. But the original manuscript of this 'Brut' is believed not to be older than the middle of the sixteenth century, and therefore not much earlier than Powel's 'History of Cambria' (1584), in which the story of the conquest of Glamorgan also appears at length, varying from the above account in only a few details. There are here added, however, long pedigrees of the descendants of the 'twelve knights,' and most critical inquirers have agreed that the fertile invention of the pedigree-makers for Glamorganshire families is the original source of the legend. But there must be some nucleus of truth and some ancient basis for the inventors to have worked upon, for the conquest of Glamorgan is undoubtedly historical, though there is no direct account of it in any earlier authority. There is nothing in itself improbable in the story of Eineon, though there are slips in detail. If he had such great connections, why did he not use them to save his native Dyved from Rhys's assault? Rhys, too, was undoubtedly slain by Bernard of Neufmarché and the conquerors of Brecheiniog. Moreover it is absurd to suppose that after doing their work the Normans would have gone home again or needed Eineon's suggestion to turn their attention to the conquest of Morganwg. Obviously the expansion of the Norman arms from Gloucester into Morganwg was as natural as that of the expansion of the Shrewsbury earldom into Powys. But the quarrels and invitations of local princes were here, as in Ireland, a determining cause of their action; and Eineon's part in the conquest is too probable and typical for us lightly to reject the whole of his history. Some Welsh families profess to be descended from Eineon (Lewys Dwnn, *Heraldic Visitations of Wales*, i. 29, Welsh MSS. Soc.; for a full list see Clarke, *Limbus Patrum Morganiæ*, p. 131 et seq.)

[Brut y Tywysogion, pp. 68–75 (Cambrian Archæological Association); Powel's History of Cambria, pp. 119–27, ed. 1584, with the comments of Mr. G. T. Clark in his first paper on the 'Land of Morgan' in xxxiv. 11–39 of the Archæological Journal, and subsequently reprinted separately with the other papers on the same subject, and those of Professor Freeman in William Rufus, ii. 79–82, 613–15, note GG; cf. Norman Conquest, v. 820.] T. F. T.

EKINS, Sir CHARLES (1768–1855), admiral, son of Dr. Jeffery Ekins [q. v.], dean of Carlisle (1782–91), and nephew of Dr. John Ekins, dean of Salisbury (1768–1809), was born in 1768, presumably at Quainton, Buckinghamshire, of which parish his father was then rector. He entered the navy in March 1781, on board the Brunswick of 74 guns, under the command of the Hon. Keith Stewart. In the Brunswick he was present in the action on the Doggerbank on 5 Aug. 1781, and afterwards went with Captain Stewart to the Cambridge, which was one of the fleet under Lord Howe that relieved Gibraltar in 1782. After continuous service on the Mediterranean and home stations for the next eight years, he was promoted to the rank of lieutenant on 20 Oct. 1790. During the next five years he was mainly employed in the West Indies. Early in 1795 he came home in the Boyne of 98 guns, bearing the flag of Sir John Jervis, and was in her when she was burnt at Spithead on 1 May. On 18 June he was promoted to the command of the Ferret sloop in the North Sea, from which he was appointed to the Echo, supposed to be at the Cape of Good Hope, but found, on his arrival, to have been condemned and broken up. He returned to England in command of one of the Dutch prizes taken in Saldanha Bay, and was advanced to post rank 22 Dec. 1796. In August 1797 he was appointed to the Amphitrite frigate, and in her was actively employed in the West Indies till March 1801, when, after a severe attack of yellow fever, he was sent home with despatches. From 1804 to 1806 he commanded the Beaulieu frigate; and from 1806 to 1811 the Defence of 74 guns, in which he took part in the expedition against Copenhagen

in 1807, in the operations on the coast of Portugal in 1808, and in the Baltic cruise of 1809. In September 1815 he commissioned the Superb of 78 guns, and commanded her in the bombardment of Algiers, on 27 Aug. 1816, when he was wounded. He afterwards, together with the other captains engaged, was nominated a companion of the Bath, and by the king of the Netherlands a knight of the order of William of the Netherlands (C.W.N.) The Superb was paid off in October 1818, and Ekins had no further service afloat; though he became in course of seniority rear-admiral on 12 Aug. 1819, vice-admiral 22 July 1830, and admiral 23 Nov. 1841; and was made a K.C.B. on 8 June 1831, a G.C.B. on 7 April 1852. He died in London on 2 July 1855. He married, in 1800, a daughter of T. Parlby of Stonehall, Devonshire.

Ekins was the author of 'Naval Battles of Great Britain from the Accession of the illustrious House of Hanover to the Battle of Navarin reviewed' (4to, 1824; 2nd edit. 1828); an interesting and useful work, though its value is lessened by the introduction of much hearsay criticism and by the total want of all reference to foreign authorities. The diagrams, too, drawn from the official despatches, which are generally vague and frequently inaccurate, are often more remarkable for the fancy than for the correctness of their delineations. He wrote also a pamphlet on the round stern controversy in the form of a letter to Sir Robert Seppings (8vo, 20 pp. 1824).

[Marshall's Roy. Nav. Biog. ii. (vol. i. pt. ii.) 764; O'Byrne's Nav. Biog. Dict.; Gent. Mag. (1855), new ser. xliv. 315.] J. K. L.

EKINS, JEFFERY, D.D. (*d.* 1791), dean of Carlisle, was a native of Barton-Seagrave, Northamptonshire, of which parish his father, the Rev. Jeffery Ekins, M.A., was rector. He received his education at Eton, whence in 1749 he was elected to King's College, Cambridge, where he obtained a fellowship (Welch, *Alumni Eton.* p. 338). He graduated B.A. in 1755 and M.A. in 1758 (*Cantabrigienses Graduati*, 1787, p. 129). On leaving the university he became one of the assistant-masters of Eton school, where he was tutor to Frederick Howard, earl of Carlisle (Jesse, *G. Selwyn and his Contemporaries*, iii. 220). Subsequently he was chaplain to the Earl of Carlisle when lord-lieutenant of Ireland. He was inducted to the rectory of Quainton, Buckinghamshire, 30 March 1761, on the presentation of his father (Lipscomb, *Bucks*, i. 422). In 1775, resigning Quainton, he was instituted to the rectory of Morpeth, Northumberland, on the presentation of the Earl of Carlisle; in February 1777 he was instituted to the rectory of Sedgefield, Durham; in 1781 he was created D.D. at Cambridge; and in 1782 he was installed dean of Carlisle, on the advancement of Dr. Thomas Percy to the see of Dromore (Le Neve, *Fasti*, ed. Hardy, iii. 248). He died at Parson's Green on 20 Nov. 1791, and was buried in Fulham Church.

He married in 1765 Anne, daughter of Philip Baker, esq. of Colston, Wiltshire, and sister of the wife of his brother, John Ekins, dean of Salisbury. His son, Admiral Sir Charles Ekins, is separately noticed.

His works are: 1. 'Florio; or the Pursuit of Happiness,' a drama, manuscript. 2. A manuscript poem upon 'Dreams,' which had great merit. 3. 'The Loves of Medea and Jason; a poem in three books translated from the Greek of Apollonius Rhodius's Argonautics,' London, 1771, 4to, 2nd edit. 1772, 8vo. 4. 'Poems,' London, 1810, 8vo, pp. 134, including the preceding work and a number of 'Miscellaneous Pieces.' Only sixty copies were printed of this collection (Martin, *Privately Printed Books*, 2nd edit. p. 190).

In early life he was the most intimate companion of Richard Cumberland, who says of him: 'My friend Jeffery was in my family, as I was in his, an inmate ever welcome; his genius was quick and brilliant, his temper sweet, and his nature mild and gentle in the extreme: I lived with him as a brother; we never had the slightest jar; nor can I recollect a moment in our lives that ever gave occasion of offence to either' (*Memoirs*, i. 124).

[Faulkner's Fulham, pp. 74, 75, 302; Hodgson's Northumberland, vol. ii. pt. ii. pp. 394, 527; Gent. Mag. vol. lxi. pt. ii. pp. 1070, 1239, 1240, vol. lxxxiii. pt. i. p. 557; Nichols's Illustr. of Lit. viii. 191, 267; Lempriere's Univ. Biog.; Cat. of Printed Books in Brit. Mus.; Lysons's Environs, ii. 369, 393; Addit. MS. 5868, f. 19 *b*.] T. C.

ELCHIES, Lord. [See Grant, Patrick, 1690–1754.]

ELD, GEORGE (1791–1862), antiquary, was born in Coventry in 1791. He carried on business successively as a miller, a silk dealer, and a dyer; he was also for twenty years editor of the 'Coventry Standard.' He was the last mayor of Coventry (1834–5) before the passing of the Municipal Reform Act, and, besides filling other public offices, an alderman of the reformed corporation till his death. During his mayoralty he restored the interior of the mayoress's parlour—an architectural relic of the fourteenth century—and throughout his life he rendered valuable service in preserving and stimulating public appreciation of the antiquities of his native

city. He had considerable ability as an artist, and made many fine drawings of ancient buildings and other memorials of the past. He died at Coventry on 22 May 1862, in his seventy-first year.

[Gent. Mag. November 1862.] J. M. S.

ELDER, CHARLES (1821–1851), painter, gained some success as an historical and portrait painter. He first exhibited at the British Institution in 1844, to which he sent 'Noli me tangere,' and at the Academy in 1845, sending 'Sappho.' He was a frequent contributor to the exhibitions, among his works being 'Florimel' (Royal Academy, 1846), 'The Death of Mark Antony' (Royal Academy, 1847), 'Rosalind' (Royal Academy, 1850), 'Jael' (British Institution, 1850). Elder died 11 Dec. 1851, aged 30, leaving a widow and three children. Two of his pictures were exhibited at the Royal Academy in the following year, viz. 'On the Thames near Twickenham' and 'An Italian Fruit Girl.' Among the portraits painted by him were those of the Marquis of Bristol and Mr. Sheriff Nicol.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Gent. Mag. 1852, new ser. xxxvii. 210, 312; Catalogues of the Royal Academy and other exhibitions.] L. C.

ELDER, EDWARD (1812–1858), headmaster of Charterhouse School, the son of John Edward Elder of Barbadoes, was born on 1 Oct. 1812. At the age of twelve he was sent to Charterhouse, where he remained till 1830, when he gained an open scholarship at Balliol College, Oxford. There he took first class honours *in literis humanioribus* and won the Ellerton theological essay prize. He graduated B.A. 1834, M.A. 1836, D.D. 1853. He held a tutorial appointment at Balliol till 1839, when he became headmaster of Durham Cathedral grammar school. This school, which he found in a languishing condition, he may be said to have made. So great was his success as a teacher and his popularity among his pupils, that when in 1853, on the nomination of Dr. Saunders to the deanery of Peterborough, he was appointed head-master of Charterhouse, many of the Durham boys, among them Professor Nettleship, migrated to London with him. At Charterhouse he worked no less hard than at Durham, but he was prevented from giving full scope to his abilities by occasional attacks of illness, which necessitated his absence from the school. Latterly his mind altogether gave way. On 6 April 1858 he died. A tablet to his memory was placed by some of his friends and pupils in Charterhouse Chapel, immediately facing the founder's tomb. Beyond contributing several articles to Smith's 'Dictionary of Classical Biography and Mythology,' Elder published nothing.

[List of Carthusians, 1879; Haig-Brown's Charterhouse, Past and Present, 1879, p. 156; Times 9 April 1858; information kindly supplied by Dr. Haig-Brown and Canon Elwin.] A. V.

ELDER, JOHN (*fl.* 1555), Scotch writer, a native of Caithness, passed twelve years of his life at the universities of St. Andrews, Aberdeen, and Glasgow, and appears to have entered the ministry. He came to England soon after the death of James V of Scotland in 1542, when he presented to Henry VIII a 'plot' or map of the realm of Scotland, being a description of all the chief towns, castles, and abbeys in each county and shire, with the situation of the principal isles. In an accompanying letter to Henry, Elder is very severe on David Beaton, denouncing him as the pestiferous cardinal, and his bishops as blind and ignorant; in the subscription he styles himself clerk and a 'redshank,' meaning by the latter designation, it is supposed, 'a roughfooted Scot or highlander.' This letter, which is now preserved in the British Museum, Royal MS. 18, A. xxxviii., was printed in vol. i. of the Bannatyne Club 'Miscellany.' In the Record Office is another letter by Elder addressed to Mr. Secretary Paget, and dated from Newcastle, 6 Oct. 1545. It gives an account of the operations of the army under the command of the Earl of Hertford in the invasion of Scotland between 8 and 23 Sept. 1545, minutely detailing their daily proceedings, with a list of the towns burnt each day (*Cal. State Papers*, Scottish Ser., i. 57). At Mary's accession Elder turned Roman catholic, as appears from his letter addressed to Robert Stuart, bishop of Caithness, 'from the Citie of London . . . the first . . . of January, 1555,' which was published as 'The Copie of a Letter sent in to Scotlande of the ariuall and landynge and . . . marryage of . . . Philippe, Prynce of Spaine to the Princess Marye Quene of England, solemnisated in the Citie of Winchester . . . whereunto is added a brefe overture or openyng of the legacion of Cardinall Poole from the Sea Apostolyke of Rome, with the substaunce of his oracyon to the kyng and Quenes Majestie for the reconcilement of the realme of Englande to the unitie of the Catholyke Churche. With the very copie also of the Supplycaciō exhibited to their highnesses by the three Estates assembled in the parliamente wherein they . . . haue submitted thēselves to the Popes Holy-

nesse,' 8vo, London [1555]. He therewith sent verses and adages written with the hand of Henry Stuart, lord Darnley, the bishop's nephew, within twelve months past, Elder then being with Darnley, who was not full nine years of age, at Temple Newsome, Yorkshire. He also refers to Darnley's noble parents as his singular good patrons. The letter is reprinted in 'The Chronicle of Queen Jane,' &c. (Camd. Soc.) Elder was not M.A. of either Oxford or Cambridge. The Elder incorporated at Oxford as being M.A. of Cambridge, 30 July 1561 (Wood, *Fasti Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, i. 159), was probably Arthur Elder, who had supplicated for the degree as long ago as 25 June 1556 (*Reg. of Univ. of Oxf.*, Oxf. Hist. Soc., i. 233).

[Cooper's Athenæ Cantabr., i. 208–9, 553; Casley's Cat. of MSS., p. 274.] G. G.

ELDER, JOHN (1824–1869), marine engineer and shipbuilder, was born at Glasgow on 8 March 1824. His family was connected with Kinross, where for several generations his forefathers had followed the occupation of wrights, for which they seemed to have a special aptitude. His father, David Elder, settled in Glasgow, and entered the establishment of Mr. Napier, the well-known shipbuilder, under whom, in 1822, he constructed the first marine engine, which was fitted up in the river Leven for the passage between Glasgow and Dumbarton. David Elder was the author of many inventions and improvements in the machinery of steam vessels, and to the excellence of his engines the success of the Cunard line of steamers, in establishing regular communication between the opposite shores of the Atlantic, was mainly due. He died in January 1866, in his eighty-second year. John Elder was his third son; he was educated at the high school of Glasgow, where he showed great excellence in mathematics and in drawing. After a five years' apprenticeship to Mr. R. Napier, and a brief time passed in English engine works, he was placed at the head of the drawing office in Napier's works. In 1852 he became a member of the firm of Randolph, Elliott, & Co., a firm that had been successful as millwrights, but had not attempted anything as marine engineers. In 1860 they began shipbuilding under the firm of Randolph, Elder, & Co.; in 1868, on the expiry of the copartnery, Elder continued the business, which reached a very great degree of prosperity. He soon became known as an engineer of singular ability. The greatest service which Elder rendered to practical engineering was the adoption of the compound or combined high and low pressure engines. Various attempts at this combination had been made before, but they had failed, owing to causes which engineers either did not understand or could not overcome. Where they had failed, Elder succeeded. Professor Macquorn Rankine, who has gone into all the details of the subject in his memoir of Elder, says that only one who had thoroughly studied and understood the principles of thermo-dynamics could have achieved this. A saving of fuel amounting to thirty or forty per cent. was effected. Elder took out many patents for improvements in marine machinery. Of some of his improvements he gave an account in papers presented to the British Association at Leeds in 1858, Aberdeen 1859, and Oxford 1860. In 1868 he read a paper before the United Service Institute in London on an improved form of war-ship, entitled 'Circular Ships of War, with immersed motive power.' In 1869 he was unanimously chosen president of the Institution of Engineers and Shipbuilders of Glasgow.

Some idea of the magnitude of his business may be formed from the fact that when in business by himself he employed four thousand men, and that from June 1868 to the end of 1869 the number of sets of engines made by him was eighteen, their aggregate horse power 6,110, the number of vessels built fourteen, their aggregate tonnage 27,027.

During 1869 he was ill for several months. He proceeded to London to get the best advice, but while there he was cut off by disease of the liver at the early age of forty-five. Elder married in 1857 Isabella, daughter of A. Ure, esq., of Glasgow. Mrs. Elder, since her husband's death, besides adding largely to the endowment of the chair of civil engineering and applied mechanics in the university of Glasgow, has recently provided an endowment for a chair of naval architecture.

Elder, as Professor Rankine remarks, was a genius in engineering. In person he was remarkably handsome, and in manner and character very attractive. He was quick and energetic in all his movements, full of resource, and remarkably enterprising. His character stood very high. Dr. Norman Macleod and others who knew him intimately pronounced him one whose great aim was to translate the facts of Christ's life into his own, especially in matters of common life. With his workpeople he was on the best of terms. He was much interested in schemes for their social, intellectual, and religious welfare; organised and contributed largely to a sick fund, and was contemplating the erection of schools and model houses on a large scale, when death ended his career. After his death the men in his employment, in begging to be

allowed to attend his funeral, testified to his many virtues as a master. The intelligent and considerate spirit in which he looked on the struggles of the working class, while at the same time fully realising both the rights and responsibilities of employers, led to the belief that in his hands the problem of the relations of capital and labour would have found a solution acceptable to all. His death at so early an age was counted a great calamity, while the multitude that attended his funeral, and the silence of all the workshops in the neighbourhood as his body was carried to its resting-place, showed how much he was esteemed by all classes in his native city.

[Rankine's Memoir of John Elder, Engineer and Shipbuilder, 1870; Maclehose's Memoirs and Portraits of a Hundred Glasgow Men, 1886.]
W. G. B.

ELDER, THOMAS (1737–1799), lord provost of Edinburgh, was the eldest son of William Elder of Loaning, by his wife Elizabeth, whose maiden name was Man. The date of his birth is not known, but he was baptised on 7 Oct. 1737 (*Parochial Registers*, county of Perth, Clunie). Elder held the office of chief magistrate of the city (where he carried on the business of a wine merchant) for three different periods, viz. 1788–90, 1792–1794, and 1796–8. During his second term of office he took a very active part in suppressing the meetings of the Friends of the People, and without any military aid he broke up the meeting of the British Convention held at Edinburgh on 5 Dec. 1793, and took ten or twelve of the principal members prisoners.

On the formation of the Royal Edinburgh Volunteers in the summer of 1794 he became their first colonel, and on 9 Sept. in the same year was voted a piece of plate by the town council 'for his spirited and prudent conduct while in office, and especially during the late commotions.' In 1795 Elder was appointed postmaster-general for Scotland. Through his exertions the scheme for rebuilding the college was successfully matured. The foundation-stone of the new buildings was laid during his first mayoralty on 16 Nov. 1789, but they were not completed until after his death, which took place at Forneth, in the parish of Clunie, on 29 May 1799, in the sixty-second year of his age. He was buried in the old church of Clunie on 2 June. In 1765 Elder married Emilia, the eldest daughter of Paul Husband of Logie, an Edinburgh merchant, by whom he left one son and four daughters. His eldest daughter, Isabella, was married on 9 Aug. 1792 to George Husband Baird [q. v.], who afterwards became principal of Edinburgh University.

Elder's portrait, by Raeburn, which was painted in 1797 at the request of the principal and professors of the university, is preserved in the court room of the university. It has been engraved by Earlom. A duplicate of this portrait was exhibited at the Raeburn exhibition in Edinburgh in 1876 (Catalogue, No. 210). Two etchings of Elder by Kay will be found in Kay's 'Original Portraits' (Nos. 144 and 310).

[Kay's Original Portraits (1877), i. 237, 358–60, 405, 406, ii. 413; Anderson's Hist. of Edinburgh (1856), pp. 283–4, 609; Andrew's Life of Sir Henry Raeburn (1886), p. 118; Sir A. Grant's Story of the University of Edinburgh (1884), ii. 207, 270; Edinburgh Magazine or Literary Miscellany, 1799, new ser. xiv. 158–60; Scots Magazine, 1789, li. 521–8, 1792, liv. 412; Haydn's Book of Dignities (1857), pp. 417, 418.] G. F. R. B.

ELDER, WILLIAM (*fl.* 1680–1700), engraver, was a Scotchman by birth, but worked in London, where he was employed principally by the booksellers. He engraved many portraits as frontispieces, but was more expert as an engraver of writing; his engraved portraits show more mechanical than artistic skill, and are mostly copied from older engravings. Among these were those of Ben Jonson, prefixed to the folio edition of his works (1692) and copied from Vaughan's engraving in the first edition (1616); John Ray, from a drawing by W. Faithorne, prefixed to his 'Wisdom of God manifested in the Creation' (8vo, 1701); Dr. Mayerne; Dr. Richard Morton, from a picture by Orchard; Charles Snell, writing-master, from a picture by Hargrave; Archbishop Sancroft, Bishop Pearson, the Earl of Oxford, and others. He engraved his own portrait twice, once in a fur cap from a crayon drawing, and again in a wig. He also engraved the plates in Savage's edition of Knolles and Rycaut's 'History of the Turks' (2 vols. London, 1701).

[Strutt's Dict. of Engravers; Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Walpole's Anecdotes of Painters, ed. Dallaway and Wornum; Vertue MSS. (Brit. Mus. Addit. MS. 23078).] L. C.

ELDERFIELD, CHRISTOPHER (1607–1652), divine, the son of William Elderfield, was born at Harwell, Berkshire, where he was baptised 11 April 1607. He received preliminary education at a local school kept by Hugh Lloyd, M.A., the vicar, and in 1621 he entered St. Mary Hall, Oxford, as a batler. In due course he took the two degrees in arts and entered into holy orders. After holding some minor appointments, one of which was apparently that of curate at Coates, Essex (manuscript note in

Elderfield's *Civill Right of Tythes*, Brit. Mus.), he became rector of Burton, Sussex. The duties of this post were no more than those of private chaplain to Sir William Goring, whose residence, Burton Place, was the only dwelling-house in the parish. There Elderfield took up his quarters and devoted himself to study. Naturally reserved, he took full advantage of his position and lived in the completest retirement. In 1650 he published 'The Civill Right of Tythes,' Lond. sm. 4to, a learned treatise, displaying much research in both law and theology. The great pains he took with a second book was believed to have cost him his life. This was 'Of Regeneration and Baptism, Hebrew and Christian,' Lond. 1653, 4to, published after his death by his executors. He died 2 Dec. 1652 at Burton Place. In his will he directed that he should be buried in the chancel of his church, but this privilege was refused by Sir William Goring, because, as was alleged, he was disappointed of the legacy he expected to receive, and the body was laid in the nave. Elderfield had left the bulk of his property, amounting to 350*l.*, to his native parish of Harwell; 284*l.* was expended in the purchase of land in South Moreton, and by a decree in chancery the remaining 66*l.* was handed to the churchwardens of the neighbouring village of Hagbourne for charitable purposes. He also left 36*l.* for the benefit of ejected ministers, and he bequeathed to the university of Oxford his manuscript of 'Lyra on the Psalms,' 'Rodolphus, his Postills,' and a copy of 'Clemens Romanus,' bound up with a 'Tract on Purgatory.' Elderfield was described by Richard Baxter (*Nonconformist's Plea for Peace*, pt. i. p. 205) as 'a very learned and great conformist.'

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ed. Bliss, iii. 336.]

A. V.

ELDERTON, WILLIAM (*d.* 1592?), ballad-writer, was a notorious tippler and a ready writer of ballads. In an account of the expenses of the Lord of Misrule at a Twelfth-day entertainment given at court, 1552–3 (*Loseley Manuscripts*, p. 47), it is recorded that one of the boy-actors was named Elderton, who may have been William Elderton. The earliest (dated) ballad of Elderton is 'The Panges of Loue and louers fttes' (*sic*), 1559, s. sh. fol., of which a copy (formerly belonging to Heber) is now in the Britwell collection. It is signed 'Finis q^d W. E.' At the foot of some ballads the name is found in full, 'Finis, W. Elderton.' Drayton, in his epistle to Henry Reynolds, writes—

I scornd your ballet then, though it were done
And had for Finis William Elderton.

A lost book, entitled 'Eldertons Jestes with his mery Toyes,' was licensed for publication in 1561–2 (Arber, *Transcript*, i. 179). It provoked 'An Admonition to Elderton to leave the toyes by him begone,' which was followed by 'Eldertons answere for his mery toyes.' Both the 'Admonition' and the 'Answer' have perished. Among Elderton's extant ballads are 'The true fourme and shape of a monsterous chyld which was borne at Stony Stratforde . . . 1565' (Huth Library and Britwell), s. sh. fol.; 'An Epytaphe upon the Death of the Right Reverent and learned Father in God, I. Iuell,' 1571, s. sh. fol. (Britwell and Roxb. Coll.); 'A ballat intituled Northomberland Newes,' &c., n. d. (licensed 1569), s. sh. fol. (Soc. of Antiq.); 'A new Yorkshyre song,' &c., 1584, s. sh. fol. (Roxb. Coll.), dated from York, describing a match at archery, in twenty-two six-line stanzas. Some verses of Elderton are printed before Hollybande's 'Arnalt and Lucenda,' 1575. Stow in his 'Survey,' 1598, p. 217 (chapter on 'Cheape Warde'), quotes some verses 'on the images over the Guildhall Gate,' composed 'about thirty yeares since by William Elderton, at that time an Atturney in the Sheriffes Courtes there.' Afterwards Elderton was master of a company of comedians, and on 10 Jan. 1573–4 he received 6*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* for a play presented before the queen. From 'A true reporte of the death and martyrdome of M. Campion,' 1581, it appears that he published some 'scurile balates' on Campion's execution. Elderton died in or before 1592. In that year Gabriel Harvey published his 'Foure Letters,' in which he describes Elderton and Robert Greene as 'two notorious mates and the very ringleaders of the riming and scribbling crew' (Harvey, *Works*, ed. Grosart, i. 164). He speaks in the same tract of 'Elderton's ale-crammed nose.' Nashe, in 'Foure Letters Confuted,' 1593, upbraids Harvey for 'plucking Elderton out of the ashes of his ale,' and says that there had been a 'monstrous emulation' between Elderton and Harvey. There are two jocular epitaphs on Elderton in Camden's 'Remaines,' 1605, p. 56. Some of his ballads were reprinted by Collier for the Percy Society ('Old Ballads from Early Printed Copies') in 1840; others are included in 'Ancient Ballads and Broadsides' (Philobiblon Society), 1867. The opening lines of a ballad by Elderton are quoted in 'Much Ado about Nothing,' v. 2.

[Ritson's Bibliographia Poetica; Hazlitt's Handbook; Hazlitt's Collections and Notes, 1876; Collier's Hist. of Engl. Dram. Poetry (1879), iii. 210–12; Collier's Old Ballads from Early Printed Copies, 1840; Ancient Ballads and

Broadsides, 1867; Bibliotheca Heberiana, pt. iv. pp. 53–63; Chappell's Popular Music of the Olden Time, pp. 107, 121, 125, 185, 229.]

A. H. B.

ELDIN, Lord. [See Clerk, John, 1757–1832.]

ELDON, Earl of. [See Scott, John, 1751–1838.]

ELDRED, JOHN (1552–1632), traveller, was born in 1552 at New Buckenham in Norfolk, to which place his father had removed from Knattishall in Suffolk, where the family had been settled for several generations. It seems probable that he went to London while still a lad, devoted himself to business and prospered. He was already a well-to-do merchant when 'upon Shrove Monday 1583' he 'departed out of London in the ship called the Tiger, in the company of Mr. John Newbery, Mr. Ralph Fitch, and six or seven other honest merchants.' On 1 May they arrived at Tripoli in Syria, and after staying there for a fortnight went on to Aleppo, and thence to Bir on the Euphrates. At Bir they took boat down the river as far as Feludjah, where after a week's delay they hired a hundred asses to convey their merchandise to Bagdad. There they stayed for some days, and, reshipping their wares in boats on the Tigris, came at length to Bassorah. At Bassorah Eldred remained for six months engaged in the business of the journey, to such good purpose that when he and his companions departed on their return, it took seventy barks, or rather barges, to carry them and their merchandise, consisting mainly of spices; bales of cinnamon and nutmeg being more especially mentioned. These barks were tracked up the stream by fourteen men to each, and so in forty-four days arrived at Bagdad, where the adventurers provisioned for the land journey, and departed in company with many other merchants, and an enormous caravan of four thousand camels, laden with spices and other rich merchandise. After forty days' journey they arrived at Aleppo on 11 June 1584. For the next three years Eldred made Aleppo his headquarters; 'in which time,' to quote his own words, 'I made two voyages more unto Babylon (Bagdad), and returned by the way aforesaid, over the deserts of Arabia. And afterwards, as one desirous to see other parts of the country, I went from Aleppo to Antioch, which is thence sixty English miles, and from thence went down to Tripoli, where, going aboard a small vessel, I arrived at Joppa, and travelled to Rama, Lycia, Gaza, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, to the river of Jordan, and the sea or lake of Sodom, and returned back to Joppa, and from thence by sea to Tripoli, of which places, because many others have published large discourses, I surcease to write.' On 22 Dec. 1587 he embarked at Tripoli for England, and 'arrived in safety here in the river of Thames with divers English merchants, 26 March 1588, in the Hercules of London, which was the richest ship of English merchants' goods that ever was known to come into this realm.' A large part of these riches appears to have belonged to Eldred. He was now a wealthy man, and, having capital at his disposal, accumulated a large fortune. In 1597 he bought the manor of Great Saxham in Suffolk, and built a large house which came to be popularly known as 'Nutmeg Hall.' He continued, however, to reside chiefly in London, engaged in multifarious business. When the East India Company was started, he was a large subscriber, was a member of the first court of directors, and for many years took a prominent part in its affairs. He was also, during the reign of James I, a contractor and commissioner for the sale of lands, a farmer of customs, and the holder of a patent for the pre-emption of tin. He died at Great Saxham in 1632, and was buried there in the church on 8 Dec.

His eldest son was born in June 1590, so that he presumably married shortly after his return from the Levant. His wife was Mary, daughter of Thomas Revett of Rishangles in Suffolk, by whom he had a large family. The firstborn son died in infancy; but the second, Revett, grew up, was made a baronet in 1641, and died without issue in 1653, when the estate of Great Saxham passed to the family of John Eldred, Revett's next brother. This became extinct in 1745, when the property was sold. 'Nutmeg Hall' was burnt down in 1779; the present hall was built by the new proprietors in the closing years of the century. In the church of Great Saxham there is a monument to the memory of John Eldred erected by his son Revett; also a bust with a mural tablet bearing the inscription:—

The Holy Land so called I have seene,
And in the Land of Babilon have beene,
But in that Land where glorious Saints doe live
My soul doth crave of Christ a roome to give.

[Eldred's Journal of his Voyage to Tripoli and Bassora is given in Hakluyt's Principal Navigations, &c. (1599), ii. 268; some interesting letters in connection with it are in Purchas his Pilgrimes, ii. 1644; for his family and personal history see Gage's Hist. and Antiq. of Suffolk, Thingoe Hundred (index); Page's Supplement to the Suffolk Traveller, p. 681; Morant's Essex, ii. 193, where there is great confusion of dates and persons; Archæologia, xv. 403, where also there seems to be great confusion between the

families of John Eldred and his kinsman Thomas Eldred [q. v.]; Cal. of State Papers (East Indies), vol. 1513–1616 (see index, in which, however, some of the entries under John Eldred appear to refer to Thomas); Cal. of State Papers (Dom.), 1603–23 (see index), in which most of the entries refer to his land contracts, grants, and financial transactions with the government, not without instances of the continually recurring confusion between different members of the family.]

J. K. L.

ELDRED, THOMAS (*fl.* 1586–1622), mariner of Ipswich, was with Thomas Cavendish [q. v.] in one or both of his voyages, but not, so far as we know, in any position of authority. In or about 1600 he was appointed to a command in the service of the East India Company (*Cal. S. P.* East Indies, 7 Nov. 1600), and appears to have continued in that service for some years as commander or factor (*ib.* 4 March 1607; 1 April 1609). Gage identifies him with the Thomas Eldred buried at Great Saxham on 5 Nov. 1622; but three years later a Thomas Eldred was at Ipswich, in command of a ship lately come from Denmark (*Cal. S. P.* Dom. 4 Oct. 1625). Thomas Eldred the mariner was certainly of Ipswich; and there is nothing beyond Gage's conjecture which connects him so closely with Great Saxham. He is said to have been of the same family as John Eldred [q. v.], but in what degree of relationship does not appear. He was not a brother, but may very probably have been a more or less distant cousin. He married Margaret Stud of Ipswich, and had a son John, alderman of Colchester, who purchased the estate of Olivers in Essex, where a portrait, possibly of Thomas Eldred, is preserved.

[Archæologia, xv. 403; Gage's Hist. and Antiq. of Suffolk, Thingoe Hundred, 107 *n.*; Morant's Essex, ii. 193, where the persons and dates are in wild confusion, John of Great Saxham, the son of John, and John of Olivers, the son of Thomas, being mixed up into one. In the indexes of the Calendars of State Papers there seems to be also great confusion between the two.]

J. K. L.

ELDRED, WILLIAM (*fl.* 1646), master gunner of Dover Castle, born about 1563, signed as a freeholder of Dover the Kentish petition for the reformation of the liturgy in 1641 (*Proc. in Kent*, Camd. Soc. p. 62), was author of 'The Gunner's Glasse, wherein the diligent Practicioner may see his defects, and may from point to point reform and amend all errors that are commonly incident to unskilful gunners,' sm. 4to, 1646. The book, an interesting account of the great gun exercise as then in vogue, has a quaint portrait labelled 'Ætatis suæ 83' with the verse,—

When Age and Art and Industry beside
Doth all invite, Experience being guide,
Then who will say but surely this may be
A piece of work exact from dotage free.

The dedication to the Earl of Warwick says that he had spent the greatest part of his time in Dover Castle; that he had been a gunner for about sixty years, and that for thirty years and more he had been making notes of matters relating to gunnery, which he has embodied in his little treatise. In the body of the work he mentions incidentally that he had served also as a gunner in the Low Countries and in Germany. It would appear probable that he was a relation of John Eldred and of Thomas Eldred [q. v.], but no identification is possible.

[Eldred's Gunner's Glasse; Cal. S. P. Dom. 1620–4.]

J. K. L.

ELEANOR, ALIENOR, or ÆNOR, Duchess of Aquitaine, Queen of France and Queen of England (1122?–1204), is said to have been born in 1122. Her father was William X, duke of Aquitaine; her mother, Ænor de Châtelleraut, died before her husband. Eleanor's grandfather, William IX, the famous troubadour and crusader, had married Philippa, daughter of William, count of Toulouse, and their son, William X, was thus able to bequeath a somewhat shadowy claim over this lordship to his daughter's second husband, Henry II of England (Geoffrey of Vigeois, pp. 304, 299; *Chron. Malleacense*, p. 403). Through the above-mentioned Philippa, whose mother was the daughter of William the Conqueror's brother, Robert, earl of Montaign, Eleanor was distantly related to her future husband Henry II (Rob. de Monte, p. 509).

William X, duke of Aquitaine, died at Compostella on Good Friday 1137. Before starting on his pilgrimage he had made arrangements for the marriage of his eldest daughter Eleanor to Louis, afterwards Louis VII, eldest son of Louis VI, king of France. By his will, which is preserved in an old chronicle, he bequeathed Aquitaine and Poitou to his prospective son-in-law. The younger Louis assumed the inheritance at Limoges (29 June 1137), and a few days later, probably on Sunday, 4 July, the marriage was celebrated at Bordeaux in presence of the nobles of Gascony, Poitou, and Saintonge (*Chron.* ap. Bouquet, xii. 115–16; *Chron. of Tours*, p. 1153; Geoffrey of Vigeois, pp. 304–5; Suger, p. 62). By this alliance the whole of south-west Gaul, from the borders of Brittany and Anjou to the Pyrenees, was added to the domains of the new French king (Will. of Newb. p. 102), who suc-

ceeded his father about 1 Aug. 1137 (Will. of Jumièges, p. 585).

On Easter day 1146 Louis and Eleanor, moved by the eloquence of St. Bernard, took the cross and started on the crusade, after receiving the pope's blessing at St. Denys, on 8 June 1147 (Suger, pp. 126–7; Odo de Diogilo, 1205–10). The story that Eleanor raised a troop of armed ladies and rode at their head as an Amazonian queen (Strickland, pp. 298–9; Larrey, p. 59; for the origin of this myth, see Nicetas, *De Manuele Comneno*, p. 80, ed. Bekker, Bonn, 1835) seems to be as purely fabulous as the tales which relate her amours in the Holy Land with Saladin, who was at this time a mere boy of thirteen. It is, however, certain that during this expedition her character was compromised by an intrigue of some kind or other with her uncle, Raymond I, prince of Antioch. This may possibly be no more than the scandal attaching itself to a close intimacy with her kinsman, who was eager to divert the efforts of the crusading host to his own aggrandisement; nor does Suger's letter to the king, in which he commends him for concealing his anger against his wife till after their return to France, enumerate any definite charge. In the latter half of 1149 Eleanor joined her husband in Calabria, whence they returned to their own kingdom by way of Rome (Will. of Tyre, xiv. c. 27; *Epp. Sugerii*, pp. 518–19).

For more than two years Eleanor continued to live with her husband, and in this period bore him a daughter, Alice, afterwards married to Theobald, count of Blois (*Vita Ludov.* vii. 126). In 1151 or 1152 they established order in Aquitaine, on the return from which expedition the question of divorce was raised, perhaps for the second time (*Chron. of Tours*, pp. 1015–16). A church council held at Beaugency under the presidency of Samson, archbishop of Rheims, dissolved the marriage on the plea of consanguinity (21 March 1152), and some contemporary historians declare this action to have been taken with the approval of St. Bernard and Pope Eugenius (*Vita Ludov.* p. 127; Richard of Poitiers, p. 101). Although long before the twelfth century came to a close it was currently reported that Louis repudiated his wife for adultery, it seems impossible to admit that such a charge was ever proved against her. The proceedings may perhaps have been due to Louis' disappointment in not having a son to succeed him. If we may trust an early chronicle of the next century, there was no lack of princes ready to espouse the divorced queen. At Blois a hasty night voyage saved her from falling into the hands of Count Theobald; at Tours, whither she fled from Blois, she narrowly escaped being seized by Geoffrey, the brother of her future husband (*Chron. of Tours*, 1616; cf. Will. of Newburgh, i. 171, and Walter Map, *De Nug. Cur.* p. 226). There is nothing improbable in these tales, but they probably belong to the same class as Brompton's legend of her intrigue with Henry II's father, Geoffrey, which Walter Map accepts, although Geoffrey seems to have died in 1152 (Brompton, pp. 1044–5; *Hist. Gaufredi*, p. 292; Hen. Hunt. p. 283). All, however, that is certain is that she made her way to Poitiers, whence she sent an embassy to Henry, who had just succeeded his father as Count of Anjou and Duke of Normandy. Dazzled by the prospect of so brilliant an alliance, he accepted her overtures and married her about Whitsuntide (Gervase of Cant. ii. 149; Rob. de Monte, p. 500).

Louis, who had hoped that his daughters would inherit the principality of their mother, now made war upon the young duke. A fever soon brought this contest to a close, and next year (1153) Henry was able to invade England. In 1154 he became king of England, and was crowned with his wife (17 Dec.) by Archbishop Theobald (Gervase of Cant. ii. 147–8, 159–60; Rob. de Monte).

Eleanor's second son, Henry, was born at London in March 1155, Matilda at London in 1156, Richard at Oxford in September 1157. Towards the end of 1158 she crossed over to Cherbourg, after Geoffrey's birth in September, to spend Christmas there with her husband. Eleanor was born at Falaise in 1161, Joan at Angers in October 1165, John in 1166 (Rob. de Monte, sub ann.)

In 1159 Henry attacked Toulouse under shelter of his wife's claims; and sixteen years later these claims were to some extent admitted, when Raymond V did homage to the king and his two elder sons at Limoges in February 1173 (Roger of Hoveden, i. 217, ii. 47; Brompton, p. 1051). During the long years of the Becket controversy Eleanor does not appear prominently; but a letter from John of Salisbury warns the archbishop that he must not look to the queen for help (1165). Five years later she seems to have been privy to the whole course of events relating to the coronation of the young Henry, and indeed to have had the business of detaining the young wife at Caen while her eldest son was being crowned in England laid upon her (*Epp. Joh. Sarisb.* ap. Bouquet, xvi. 242, 431.)

The peculiar position in which Eleanor stood with regard to Aquitaine may have influenced Henry II when in 1168, after the revolt of the Counts of March and Aqui-

taine, he left her in the disturbed district under the care of Count Patrick of Salisbury (Rob. de Monte, p. 517). Two years later it was at her intercession that the king invested his son Richard with the duchy (about August 1170) (Geoffrey of Vigeois, p. 318; Roger of Hoveden, ii. 5, 6). Her affection for her children induced her to abet them in the great rebellion of 1173, if indeed she was not, as some contemporary accounts assert, the prime mover of the revolt. Eleanor had prepared to follow her three elder sons in their flight, and had even put on man's attire to facilitate her escape, when she was seized by the king's orders and put under strict guard, from which she was not fully released till her husband's death sixteen years later (Gerv. of Cant. i. 242; Rob. de Monte, p. 521). A letter is still preserved that must have been written about the spring of 1173, when she was already contemplating this step, in which the Archbishop of Rouen urges her to return to 'her lord and husband before things get worse,' and warns her that it is really herself and her sons that she is injuring by her conduct (*Epp. Petri Bles.* ap. Bouquet, xv. 630). For the next sixteen years the chroniclers are almost silent as regards the queen. Somewhere about Easter 1174 she was led into England along with her daughter-in-law. According to Geoffrey of Vigeois her place of confinement was Salisbury; another account makes it Winchester. Probably she was not treated with great severity, for though we find Henry negotiating with the papal legate (*c.* October 1175) about a divorce from his 'hated queen,' she was apparently still produced in public for occasions of ceremony. Thus she was present at the concord between Henry and his sons in December 1184; and in the following spring Richard restored Poitou to her at his father's command. According to one writer she was released from prison in this year (1185) at the request of Baldwin, the newly elected archbishop of Canterbury. Possibly, too, the dying petition of the young king Henry (*d.* 11 June 1183), in which he entreated his father on behalf of his captive mother, may have softened the old king's heart; added to which, since the death of Rosamond (about 1176), he had perhaps no longer the same inducements to seek a divorce (Geoff. of Vig. p. 331; Rob. de Monte, p. 523; Gervase of Cant. i. 256; Roger of Hoveden, ii. 288, 304; *De Morte &c. Henrici Jun.*, ap. Stevenson, *Ralph of Coggeshall*, pp. 267, 273).

The death of her husband (6 July 1189) freed Eleanor even from the semblance of restraint. In the days that elapsed before the coronation of Richard it was her efforts that secured the recognition of her son in England and the peace of the country. She made a royal progress through the land; she released the county prisoners from the gaols; and received oaths in her son's name. In earlier days men had seen the fulfilment of Merlin's prophecies when the 'eagle of the broken treaty' urged her sons to their revolt against her husband; now they found a more generous application of the prophecy, and imagined that in thus preparing for the coronation of her third-born son the same eagle 'was rejoicing in her third nesting' (Rog. of Hoveden, iii. 4; Ralph de Dic. ii. 67; cf. Rich. of Poitiers, ap. Bouquet, xii. 420; *Epp. Joh. Sarisb.* ap. Bouquet, p. 534).

In the spring of 1190 Eleanor accompanied her son and his betrothed bride, Alice of France, to Normandy. On 30 March 1191 she brought Richard's future wife, Berengaria of Navarre, to Sicily; and three days later started back home by way of Rome, where she had an interview with Pope Celestine III on the matter of Geoffrey's election to the see of York. The Christmas of this year she spent in Normandy at Bonneville. She reached Portsmouth 11 Feb. 1192 (Rich. of Devizes, p. 55). A little later in the same spring she prevented John from crossing to France, as she suspected he was meditating some treachery towards his brother. In the same spirit she exacted an oath of fealty from all the lords of the realm to the same king (Lent 1192). When the news of Richard's captivity arrived, she was the very soul of the resistance offered to the contemplated invasion of Philip and John. Her commands brought all the English, noble and ignoble, knights and rustics alike, to guard the south-eastern coast (Easter 1193). She assumed the custody of Wallingford Castle and Windsor from the doubtful fidelity of John, who had now returned to England (April). It was to her that Richard wrote his orders about the collection of his ransom, and it was with her seal that the money-bags were stamped for protection when it was raised. In December the king called her to his presence; at Mayence, on 2 Feb. 1194, she was present when the emperor displayed the fatal evidence of her youngest son's complicity in the plot against his brother; and lastly, it was into her keeping that the captive king was delivered two days later (Rog. of Hoveden, iii. 4, 5, 32, 95, 100, 179, &c.; Ralph de Dic. ii. 67, &c.; Gervase of Cant. i. 515; Rich. of Devizes, p. 557).

In the same year she attended the great council of Nottingham (30 March 1194), and on 17 April was present at Richard's solemn

recoronation in St. Swithin's Church, Winchester. In 1198 she was accused of being privy to the attempted escape of Philip, bishop of Beauvais, Philip Augustus's cousin (Rog. of Hoveden, iii. 231, iv. 40–1).

It was owing to Eleanor's influence that Richard had consented to pardon his brother John; and on the death of this king (6 April 1199) the aged mother at once exerted herself to secure the succession of her youngest son. When the barons of Anjou declared for her grandson Arthur, she joined Richard's mercenary leader Marchadeus, and laid waste the district. Early in the next year, though now almost eighty years old, she started for Castile, to make arrangements for the marriage of Alfonso's daughter Blanche, her own grandchild, with Philip Augustus's son Louis, afterwards Louis VIII. On her return she spent Easter at Bordeaux (9 April), and soon after, 'worn out with the toils of her journey and old age,' betook herself to the abbey of Fontevraud, which already sheltered the bodies of her husband and two of her children. From this seclusion she was called once more by the outbreak of war between John and Philip in 1202. She was staying at Mirabeau, with only a scanty guard, when her grandson Arthur, accompanied by Geoffrey de Lusignan and Hugh Brown, laid siege to the castle, and would have had to surrender had not the king, hearing of her position, made a night march to her assistance, and taken her assailants captive (about 30 July 1202). Two years later Eleanor died (1 April 1204), and was buried at Fontevraud (Will. of Newburgh, ii. 424; Rog. of Hoveden, iii. 367, iv. 84, 89, 96, 107; Matt. Paris, ii. 488; Rigord, ap. Bouquet, xvii. 55; Ralph of Coggeshall, p. 135; *Annals of Waverley*, p. 256).

Eleanor had two children by her first husband, Louis VII: Mary (*d.* 1198), who married Henry, count of Champagne; and Alice, who married Theobald, count of Blois. Her sons by Henry II have been mentioned above, except her first-born, William (1153–1156). Her daughters by Henry were Matilda (1156–1189), who married Henry of Saxony; Eleanor (1162–1214), who married Alfonso III of Castile; and Joan (1165–99), who married first William II of Sicily, and secondly Raymond of Toulouse.

[Authorities quoted above. They are nearly all to be found in the great collections of Bouquet and Migne. William of Newburgh and the English historians are quoted from the Rolls Ser. edition; Geoffrey of Vigeois from Labbé, Bibliotheca MSS.; Robert de Monte from Pertz, vol. vi. The Chronicle of Tours is printed in Martène and Durand's Amplissima Collectio. Walter Map's De Nugis Curialium has been edited for the Camden Society by T. Wright. For Brompton see Twysden's Decem Scriptores. For the Historia Gaufredi in Marchegay's Comtes d'Anjou; Richard of Devizes for the English Historical Society.] T. A. A.

ELEANOR of Castile (*d.* 1290), queen of Edward I, daughter of Ferdinand III of Castile, by his second wife, Joanna, half-sister of Alfonso X, and heiress through her mother of the counties of Ponthieu and Montreuil, a princess of great beauty and discretion, met her future husband at Burgos, and was married to him in the monastery of Las Huelgas in October 1254. Her marriage was politically important, for in consideration of it Alfonso transferred to Edward his claims on Gascony, and it also brought him the succession to her mother's possessions; Edward settled 1,000*l.* a year upon her, which was to be increased to 1,500*l.* on his attaining the throne (*Fœdera*, i. 519). She stayed for a year with her husband in Gascony, and came to England shortly before him, landing at Dover, and entering London 17 Oct. 1255, where she was received with much state, and was lodged in the house occupied by her brother Sanchey, archbishop-elect of Toledo, in the New Temple. Sanchey was visiting England with reference to the projected marriage of the king's daughter Beatrix, and his extravagance at the king's expense filled the Londoners with anger against Eleanor's fellow-countrymen (Matt. Paris, v. 509, 513). She was joined by her husband before the end of November. When Edward returned from France, in February 1263, he placed her in Windsor Castle, and she appears to have remained there until after the battle of Lewes, when, on 18 June 1264, the king, who was then wholly under the power of the Earl of Leicester, was made to command her departure. She then took refuge in France, remained there until after the battle of Evesham, and returned to England 29 Oct. 1265. She accompanied her husband on his crusade in 1270. When, after he had been wounded by an assassin at Acre, it was proposed to cut all the inflamed flesh out of his arm, the surgeon ordered that she should be taken away from him, evidently lest her unrestrained grief should increase his danger, and she was led away 'weeping and wailing' (Hemingburgh, i. 336). The famous story of her saving his life by sucking the poison from the wound is noticed as a mere report by the Dominican Ptolomæus Lucensis (*d.* 1327 ?) in his 'Ecclesiastical History' (xxiii. c. 6), and is evidently utterly unworthy of credit. She was crowned with her husband on 19 Aug. 1274. After her return in 1265

she appears never to have been long absent from Edward. Though pious and virtuous, she was rather grasping. Archbishop Peckham interfered on behalf of some of her overburdened tenants, and told her that reparation must precede absolution. She had given scandal by joining with Jewish usurers, and getting estates from christians (*Peckham Reg.* ii. 619, iii. 939). She appears to have fallen sick of a low fever in the end of the summer of 1290, and was probably placed by the king at 'Hardeby' (Rishanger, p. 120) or Harby in Nottinghamshire. After he had met his parliament at Clipstone he returned to Harby on 20 Nov., and remained with her until her death on the 28th. Her corpse was embalmed, and her funeral procession left Lincoln on 4 Dec.; her body was buried at Westminster on the 17th by the Bishop of Lincoln, and her heart was deposited in the church of the Dominicans. The route taken by the funeral procession is ascertained by the notices of the crosses that the king erected to her memory at Lincoln, Grantham, Stamford, Geddington, Northampton, Stony Stratford, Woburn, Dunstable, St. Albans, Waltham, West-cheap, and Charing. The effigy on her tomb, of remarkable beauty, appears to have been the work of an English goldsmith named William Torrell.

[For authorities see Strickland's Queens, i. 418; Ptolomæi Lucensis Hist. Eccl., Rerum Ital. SS., Muratori, xi. 743, and col. 1168. For details concerning Eleanor's sickness, death, funeral, and the chantries and other foundations in her honour see Archæologia, xxix. 186, and Engl. Hist. Rev. (April 1888), x. 315.] W. H.

ELEANOR of Provence (*d.* 1291), queen of England and wife of Henry III, was the daughter of Raymond Berenger IV, count of Provence, and his wife Beatrix, sister of Amadeus III of Savoy. Both her father and her mother figure among the Provençal poets, and Eleanor herself is reported to have composed an heroic poem while yet a child, in her native language. This poem, which is said to be still extant, she despatched to her future brother-in-law, Richard, earl of Cornwall. Her learning and accomplishments were doubtless largely due to the fact that she had for her instructors that Romeo whom seventy years later Dante celebrated for his merit and his misfortunes (*Parad.* vi.; Fauriel, ap. Strickland, *Lives of the Queens of England*).

Towards the middle of June 1235 the negotiations for her marriage commenced, and by October proctors had been appointed to receive the lady's dower. As, however, this was not forthcoming, Eleanor was despatched to her husband apparently without any portion. The marriage was celebrated by Edmund Rich, archbishop of Canterbury, in his cathedral city, 14 Jan. 1236, and the coronation ceremony was performed at Westminster on the following Sunday, 20 Jan. (Rymer, i. 341, 344-6; Gervase of Cant. ii. 130; Matt. Paris, iii. 334; *Ann. of Tewkesbury and of Waverley*, pp. 99, 316). The unpopularity from which the young queen seems to have suffered during the whole of her life in England perhaps had its beginning in the fact that she was accompanied by her uncle William, bishop elect of Valence. This prelate at once acquired an immense influence with the king, and there went round a rumour that, under his advice, Henry was meditating a change in the constitution of his kingdom (Matt. Paris, iii. 234; Stubbs, ii. 53). Though this uncle had to leave England very soon (c. February 1237), he returned before long, after having carried off an immense treasure to his native land. The king, it was currently said, was becoming uxorious, and suffering his own realm to be ruined by strangers from Poitou, Provence, or elsewhere. Early in 1245 Eleanor procured the appointment of another uncle, Boniface of Savoy, as the successor to the saintly patriot, Edmund Rich, at Canterbury. Nor was her unpopularity lessened when it was discovered (1246) that the large annual payments made to her mother for the last five years were being diverted to the profit of her alien brother-in-law, Charles of Anjou. Against these causes of discontent should, however, be set certain other points which tell in her favour, such as the appointment of her physician and confessor, the learned Nicholas of Farnham, to the see of Durham (9 June 1241); and her successful effort in the same year to reconcile her husband with the earl marshal, the restoration of whose office and earldom she also procured 27 Oct. (Matt. Paris, iii. 387, 388, iv. 86, 158, 259, 505).

In 1242 Eleanor accompanied her husband to Gascony (20 May); and it was his extravagance and delay on her account, about the time of her confinement at Bordeaux (June 25), that led to the failure of this expedition and the return home of the discontented nobles. Towards the end of the next year she went home in time to be present at the marriage of Eleanor's sister, Sancia, with Henry's brother, Richard, earl of Cornwall. About the same time she persuaded the king to transfer Gascony and Chester from his brother to her son Edward; but, notwithstanding this, when the king crossed over to Bordeaux next year (6 Aug. 1253) he left his wife and brother as joint-governors of the kingdom. Early in 1254 she was engaged in raising money for

the king's necessities, and it was in her name that the remarkable council of Westminster (25 April) was summoned. Shortly afterwards, despite the king's prohibition, she left England (May 29) for Bordeaux. After a family meeting at Chartres, she made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Edmund at Pontigny, was splendidly entertained by Louis IX at the old Temple in Paris, and disembarked at Dover on 27 Dec. (Matt. Paris, v. 42, &c.; *Lib. de Ant. Leg.* p. 23).

Meanwhile the popular discontent does not seem to have diminished. In 1250 she was accused of exacting a vast sum of money from Aaron the Jew; in 1255 not only the queen, but also the king and the Archbishop of Canterbury, her uncle, were impoverishing themselves to support the ambition of their uncle or brother Thomas of Savoy in North Italy. Three years later, at the time when Henry had no means for his own war against the Welsh, he could still supply funds for the queen's kinsman (June 1258). Nor was Eleanor viewed with greater favour by the king's Poitevin kinsmen, who perhaps grudged her the control of money they thought might be better spent among themselves, and certainly attributed all their misfortunes to her misconduct when they were banished from the realm (18 July 1258). Next year (11 Nov.) she was present when Henry did homage to his brother-in-law for Aquitaine.

Eleanor at first appears to have approved of the provisions of Oxford; but on finding that they could be turned to the hurt of her own kinsmen she is credited with influencing her husband and her eldest son against them (*Ann. of Wav.* p. 355). After various journeys to and from France she took refuge in the Tower of London (May 26); and it was while attempting to go from this place to Westminster by water (July 13) that she met with that ill-treatment at the hands of the Londoners for which her son Edward took so disastrous a revenge at the battle of Lewes. Three months later she had an interview with Louis IX at Boulogne (4 Oct.), and remained abroad after her husband's return (7 Oct. 1263). During the course of the next year she was vainly attempting to get aid for her husband in the 'barons' war' that had now broken out. After the battle of Lewes she had gathered a great host of mercenary troops at Sluys, and the king, who was now a prisoner, had to issue orders for the protection of the coast against the descent of his own partisans. When her funds were exhausted her army melted away. On 29 Oct. 1265 she landed in England with the papal legate. The rest of her life presents little of interest. She was so heavily weighted with debt that the twenty thousand marks with which the Londoners atoned for their insults had to be sent abroad for her creditors' satisfaction. On 3 July 1276 she took the veil at Amesbury, where she died, 25 June 1291, and was buried with great ceremony, in the presence of her son, Edward I, and nearly all the prelates and nobles of England, 9 Sept. Her heart was interred in the church of the Franciscans in London (9–10 Dec.) The monastic chroniclers of the time reproach her for not having resigned her possessions on becoming a nun. But it is probable that she was unable to do this owing to her immense debts. These her son Edward ordered to be paid after her death.

The extreme unpopularity of Queen Eleanor is reflected in nearly all the contemporary annalists. Nor were these unfortunate relations confined to her subjects alone. In 1252 her arrogant conduct provoked her patient husband into an exclamation against feminine pride. Despite the affection which her eldest son, Edward, seems to have constantly shown for her, she is said by one chronicler to have been the cause of the quarrel between him and his father in 1260. Even her affection for her kinsmen is no justification for her waste of English treasure on their behalf. On the other hand, her character presents not a few good points. Though apparently somewhat of an invalid (cf. *Ann. Dunst.* p. 203), she acted with vigour in the great crisis of 1264, and seriously angered the barons of the Cinque ports by hanging some of their partisans about the same time. The influence she exercised over her husband was perhaps, to some extent, continued over her son Edward I, if it be true, as one chronicler asserts, that it was at her prompting that he expelled the Jews from England.

Eleanor's children were: Edward (I of England) [q.v.]; Edmund, afterwards Earl of Lancaster (*b.* 16 Jan. 1245); Margaret (*b.* 29 Sept. 1240), married Alexander III of Scotland; Beatrice, married John de Dreux, duke of Brittany; Katherine (*b.* 25 Nov. 1253).

[See authorities quoted in the text.] T. A. A.

ELERS, JOHN PHILIP (*fl.* 1690–1730), potter, was the son of Martin Elers, and grandson of Admiral Elers, commander of the fleet at Hamburg, who was a member of a noble Saxon family, and married a lady of the princely house of Baden. Martin Elers quitted his native country and settled in Amsterdam, of which town he became burgomaster, and is said to have entertained the exiled queen, Henrietta Maria. He married in 1650 a daughter of Daniel van Mildert, by whom he had a daughter, married to Sir

William Phipps, and two sons, John Philip, to whom Queen Christina and the elector of Mayence stood sponsors, and David. These two are said to have come to London in the train of the Prince of Orange in 1688, and David set up as a merchant there. It is uncertain what led Elers to the discovery of the fine red clay at Bradwell in Staffordshire suitable for producing red ware in imitation of the oriental hard red pottery which was being imported by the East India companies into England. The brothers may have heard of it from John Dwight, the Fulham potter [q. v.] Somewhere about 1690 Elers settled at a place called Bradwell Wood, near Burslem, a very secluded spot, where he established a manufactory. The productions were stored at a place called Dimsdale, about a mile distant, and the buildings were said to be connected by a speaking tube; the pottery was disposed of by David Elers in London, at his shop in the Poultry. Their special production was a red unglazed pottery, chiefly teapots, of very tasteful shape, with slight raised ornamentations of an oriental character executed with stamps. So anxious were the brothers Elers to preserve their secret, that they employed the stupidest workmen they could obtain, and an idiot to turn the wheel. Great curiosity was excited, and at last a man called Twyford and John Astbury [q. v.] were successful in discovering the secret, the latter by feigning idiocy. It is now generally admitted that the brothers Elers were the introducers of salt-glazing into Staffordshire, though they do not seem to have worked much with it themselves. From the date of the discovery of Elers's secret a marked and wide-spreading change took place in the productions of the surrounding potteries; greater taste and intelligence were shown, and the oriental influence soon developed into a real English style. Authentic specimens of the Elers ware are of extreme rarity. Elers, when the secret was no longer private, quitted Bradwell, and became connected with the glass manufactory at Chelsea, where he assisted in the manufacture of soft porcelain. Subsequently he removed to Dublin, where he set up a glass and china shop. He married Miss Banks, by whom he was father of Paul Elers, who was educated for the law, and married Mary, the daughter and heiress of Edward Hungerford of Blackbourton Court, Oxford. He died in 1781, aged 82, leaving by her, among other children, Maria, the wife of Richard Lovell Edgeworth [q. v.], and mother of Maria Edgeworth, the novelist [q. v.] There is a medallion portrait of John Philip Elers done by Wedgwood, from a painting in the possession of the family, and there are two small mezzotint portraits of Paul Elers and his wife, engraved from the life by Butler Clowes [q. v.]

[Shaw's Hist. of the Staffordshire Potteries; Solon's Art of the old English Potter; Church's English Earthenware; Jewitt's Life of Josiah Wedgwood; Miss Meteyard's Life of Josiah Wedgwood.] L. C.

ELFLEDA or **ÆLFLÆD** (654–714?), abbess of Whitby. [See under EANFLÆD, *b.* 626.]

ELFLEDA (*d.* 918?), the lady of the Mercians. [See ETHELFLEDA.]

ELFORD, RICHARD (*d.* 1714), vocalist, became famous in London as a singer of sacred music at the beginning of the seventeenth century. In his youth he belonged to the choirs of Lincoln and Durham cathedrals, and came to London to display his fine counter-tenor on the stage. His success at the theatres was small, owing to his awkward and ungainly appearance (HAWKINS quoting Dr. Tudway). Elford was sworn a gentleman of the Chapel Royal on 2 Aug. 1702, 'in an additional place to be added to the establishment,' but there is no mention in the Cheque-book of the addition of 100*l.* to his salary for the excellence of his voice, referred to by several writers. Elford was also appointed lay vicar at St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey. His talent is praised by Croft as 'excelling all (as far as is known) that ever went before him, and fit to be imitated by all that came after him, he being in a peculiar manner eminent for his giving a due energy and proper emphasis to the words of his music,' and also by Weldon, who composed six solo anthems for the celebrated counter-tenor. Elford was also admired in profane music; he was chosen to take part in the performance before Queen Anne at St. James's Palace of Eccles's 'Birthday Songs,' in 1703, and was advertised to sing 'some new songs accompanied by the lute' at York Buildings in the same year. No mention of Elford is made by Downes or Genest. The well-known dancer, Mrs. Elford, was in the cast of D'Urfey's 'Wonders of the Sun,' given at the Haymarket in 1706, and this fact, noted by Downes, may have led to the assertion by Hawkins and later historians that Elford sang a part in that play. In Carey's poem, 'On the Death of the late famous Mr. Elford,' published in 1720, his loss is deplored in extravagant terms, and the patronage accorded to Elford by Queen Anne is alluded to. Some songs 'set by Mr. Elford,' 'Brightest Nymph,' 'To thee, O gentle Sleep' (Tamerlane), 'To Chloris all soft charms agree,' and 'Ah! cruel Damon,

cease,' are in the British Museum. Elford died on 29 Oct. 1714. He had a brother a singer in the Dublin Cathedral choir.

[Hawkins's History of Music, 1853, p. 718; Cheque-book of Chapel Royal, ed. Rimbault, pp. 24, 27; Croft's Musica Sacra (1724), preface; Weldon's Divine Harmony (1725), first collection; Daily Courant, 19 March 1703; Downes's Roscius Anglicanus, various editions, lines following the entry of 9 April 1705; Carey's Poems, 1720, p. 22; Eccles's Songs and Symphonies, 1703; Elford's printed Songs, Nos. 98 and 99 in Horton collection, and No. 143 in collection by Walsh, Brit. Mus. Library.]

L. M. M.

ELFORD, Sir WILLIAM (1749–1837), banker, politician, and amateur artist, of Bickham, Buckland Monachorum, Devonshire, born in August 1749, was the elder son of the Rev. Lancelot Elford of Bickham, and Grace, daughter of Alexander Wills of Kingsbridge, Devonshire. His family was one of the oldest in the west of England. He was a partner in the banking firm at Plymouth of Elford, Tingcombe, & Clerk, and was connected in many capacities with the same town. He was mayor of Plymouth in 1797, and recorder from 1798 to February 1833; M.P. for Plymouth from 1796 to 1806, when he was defeated, and brought an unsuccessful petition against his antagonist, Sir C. M. Pole, bart. He also represented Westbury for some time. In July 1807 he was elected M.P. for Rye, but resigned his seat in July 1808. He was lieutenant-colonel of the South Devon militia, and in that capacity accompanied his regiment to Ireland during the Irish rebellion, 1798–9. On 29 Nov. 1800 he was created a baronet. He lived the latter part of his life at the Priory, Totnes, and was recorder of that borough for some years. He died at that place on 30 Nov. 1837, aged 89, and was buried in the parish church, where there is a tablet to his memory. Elford was a friend of William Pitt the younger; frequently visited Bath, where he was noted as a whist-player; was acquainted with many of the leading literary characters and artists of his day; possessed considerable scientific attainments, and in 1790 was elected fellow of the Royal Society and the Linnean Society. A few years before his death he published the results of his investigations as to a substitute for common yeast, and his discoveries excited some attention. Elford was also an artist of great excellence; he was a constant contributor to the Royal Academy exhibitions from 1774 to 1837, and his pictures were marked by great taste and good draughtsmanship. The last exhibited by him was painted in his eighty-ninth year. There are two water-colour sketches by him in the print room at the British Museum. His most important picture was 'The White Lady of Avenel,' exhibited in 1822, and now in the possession of his grandson, Colonel Henry Cranstoun Adams of Lion House, Exmouth, and Crapstone, Buckland Monachorum. There is a landscape by Elford at Windsor Castle, which he presented to the prince regent in 1819, and he also presented pictures painted by himself to the university of Oxford and to many of his friends. Elford was twice married; his first wife was Mary, daughter and heiress of the Rev. John Davies of Plympton, who died in 1817, leaving one son, Jonathan Elford, who married and died in 1823 without issue, and two daughters, Grace Chard, died unmarried 24 Feb. 1856, and Elizabeth, who became the wife of General Sir George Pownoll Adams, K.C.H.; his second wife was Elizabeth, daughter of Humphrey Hall of Manadon, and widow of Lieutenant-colonel Walrond. At Elford's death the baronetcy became extinct. James Northcote, R.A. [q. v.], was an intimate friend of the Elford family, and painted numerous portraits of them, most of which, with others, are in the possession of the grandson, already mentioned, Colonel H. C. Adams, at Exmouth.

[Gent. Mag. 1838, new ser. ix. 206; Burke's Extinct Baronetage; Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art, xviii. 114; Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Royal Academy Catalogues; information from Colonel H. C. Adams and others.]

L. C.

ELGIN, Earls of. [See Bruce, James, 1811–1863, eighth earl, governor-general of India; Bruce, Robert, *d.* 1685, second earl; Bruce, Thomas, 1655?–1741, third earl; Bruce, Thomas, 1766–1841, seventh earl.]

ELGIVA. [See Ælfgifu, *fl.* 956.]

ELIAS, JOHN (1774–1841), Welsh methodist preacher, was born on 6 May 1774 at a 'small tenement' called Brynllwynbach, in the parish of Abererch, four miles east of Pwllheli in Carnarvonshire. His parents 'were in humble circumstances, but they lived comfortably and respectably.' As a boy he was chiefly influenced by his paternal grandfather, a small farmer and weaver, who taught him to read, and gave him his earliest religious impressions. The grandfather would take the boy after church to hear some of the famous South Wales methodists. Elias thus became very religious, and was constantly convulsed with inward struggles and temptations. His chief difficulty was about Sunday amusements. He at last conquered this supreme temptation, and occupied himself on that day in teaching

children to read. 'Perhaps this was the first Sunday school in Carnarvonshire.' He read every Welsh book he could obtain, and walked ten miles or more for a sermon on Sunday. He gradually became a decided methodist, though he long hesitated from fear of backsliding, even when his faith was so strong that he was only turned from an eighty-mile pilgrimage to Llangeitho by the death of Daniel Rowlands. When about eighteen his religious impressions were deepened during a journey to the Bala association. He took service under a methodist weaver named G. Jones, who lived near Pen y Morva, through whose influence he at last, in September 1793, joined the methodist society at Hendre Howel. On Christmas day 1794 he was 'received a member of the monthly meeting, and allowed the privilege of attempting to preach the gospel.' His fame as an itinerant preacher was spread through Carnarvonshire. He besought the brethren to allow him to accept an invitation to half a year's schooling in Manchester, but was 'sharply rebuked' for the pride which prompted the request. He was permitted, however, to have some months' schooling at the Rev. E. Richardson's school at Carnarvon, where he 'made such progress in English as enabled him to understand the subject-matter of what he was reading in that language,' and 'became tolerably conversant with the Greek and Hebrew scriptures, especially through lexicons.' This was in 1796. On 22 Feb. of that year he married Elizabeth Broadhead, who kept a shop at Llanvechell in Anglesey, where Elias subsequently resided. He had by her four children, two only of whom survived their birth. For the first years of their marriage they had a hard struggle, but latterly the business improved, and Elias was able to leave the entire management to his wife and devote himself exclusively to preaching. Anglesey, the immediate sphere of his operations, was in an exceptionally low moral and religious condition. But his incessant denunciations of 'fornication, wrecking, drunkenness, Sabbath breaking,' and the other characteristic sins of the island, worked a great reformation. 'His preaching at length became the most attractive of the island, so that he was attended by the whole population of the neighbourhood wherever he went, and places of worship hitherto shunned as contemptible were frequented when he occupied them by even respectable people.' The conversion of Anglesey to methodism dates from his work there. But, like all the old Welsh preachers, he wandered far and wide on his mission. He was known all over Wales; he frequently preached at Liverpool; and was equally welcomed in Manchester, Bristol, and London by his fellow-countrymen residing in those cities. The effects of his preaching were extraordinary. His unique power over his audience suggests the comparison with Whitefield, whom he also resembled in his rigid Calvinistic theology. But though rough and untrained he showed more logical capacity than Whitefield. His few printed sermons show little of the power exerted by his 'unearthly tone and supernatural force, his gleaming eyes, his ideas flashing forth like the lightning.' Striking stories are told of his scattering by his eloquence the unhallowed Sunday fair at Rhuddlan; his great speech at a Bible Society's meeting at Beaumaris; and his glowing description of how Lord Anglesey was saved at Waterloo to preside over that assembly. He soon won a foremost place in his connexion, and was one of the first preachers to be ordained at Bala in 1811, when the methodists practically seceded from the established church. He took a prominent part in drawing up the methodists' articles of faith (1823), and in insisting on their necessity. He accumulated a great deal of information on theological and historical subjects, and at the end of his life warmly welcomed the establishment of theological colleges in his denomination. He was hot and violent in his creed, and bitterly opposed to the 'Arminian methodists' for breaking up the unity of doctrine in North Welsh religious bodies. He was a strong tory and loyalist, a great admirer of George III, and an irreconcilable opponent of catholic emancipation. He was especially careful in checking the disorders that in some cases tend to flow from great religious excitement. He made great exertions for the Bible Society, the London Missionary Society, and for Sunday schools. He was an early advocate of total abstinence.

In 1829 Elias's wife died, and on 10 Feb. 1830 he married Lady Bulkeley, the widow of Sir John Bulkeley, a lady whose wealth set him free from all worldly cares, and whose social position did not prevent the union from being one of complete happiness. After this marriage he resided at a house called Vron, near Llangevni, also in Anglesey. In 1832 he had a serious carriage accident, from which he never completely recovered. In 1840 he contracted a fresh sickness when preaching. He died on 8 June 1841. Ten thousand persons, it was believed, attended his funeral in Llanvaes churchyard. 'As a preacher,' cried his enthusiastic medical attendant, 'there has not been his equal since the apostle to the Gentiles.' He was certainly the greatest orator among the

remarkable series of the preachers of early Welsh methodism.

His published writings include: 1. 'Traethawd ar y Sabboth,' 1809, which has gone through several editions. 2. 'Buddioldeb yr iau i bobl ieuainge, neu bregeth ar Galar. iii. 27,' 1818. 3. 'Teyrnged i goffadwriaeth brenin rhinweddol: Sylwedd pregeth a bregethwyd ar yr achlysur o farwolaeth George y Trydydd,' 1820. 4. 'Marwolaeth gweision ffyddlawn i Dduw yn achlysur i annog y rhai byw i ymwroli y' ngwasanaeth eu Harglwydd; sef, Sylwedd pregeth [on Josh. i. 2] a draddodwyd y' Nghymdeithasfa,' Pwllheli, 1826. 5. 'The Death of a faithful Minister, with a view to the decease of Rev. E. Morris,' the above translated into English, 1826. 6. 'Mawr ddrwg y pechod o ymgaledu o dan freintiau crefyddol; sef, Sylwedd pregeth a draddodwyd y' Nghymdeithasfa,' Llanrwst, 1828. 7. 'Cofiant o fywyd a marwolaeth R. Jones, Dinas; At yr hyn ychwanegwyd pigion o'i lythyrau ac o'i waith prydyddol, Ynghyd a llythyr ats oddiwrth T. Charles,' 1834. 8. 'Annogaeth i'r Cymry i bleidio cadwraeth y Sabbath trwy anfon eirchion i'r Senedd,' Bangor, 1836. 9. 'Pregethau y diweddar Barch. J. Elias wedi eu hysgrifenu mewn llaw fer—gan R. Hughes,' 1849. 10. 'Pregeth i bobl ieuainc,' 1850. 11. 'Traethawd ar Gyfiawnhad Pechadur, yn dangos y ffordd y mae Duw . . . yn cyfiawnhau pechaduriaid,' 1870. 12. 'The Two Families, a Sermon,' twice printed in English.

[Elias's autobiographical memoirs form the basis of the Life of John Elias, by the Rev. E. Morgan of Syston, who also edited Valuable Letters, Essays, and other Papers of John Elias, which contain additional biographical material; Owen Jones's Great Preachers of Wales; Richard Parry's Adgofion am J. Elias; the estimate of his contemporaries may be seen, for example, in Foulkes's Coffadwriaeth y Cyfiawn, pregeth ar yr achlysur o farwolaeth J. Elias (1842); and in Eliasia, neu rai sylwadau ar gymeriad areithyddol a phregethwraethol J. Elias (1844); Cat. of Printed Books in Brit. Mus.] T. F. T.

ELIBANK, Lords. [See Murray.]

ELIOT. [See also Eliott, Elliot, Elliott, and Elyot.]

ELIOT, EDWARD, Lord Eliot (1727–1804), politician, eldest son of Richard Eliot of Port Eliot, Cornwall, who married in March 1726 Harriot, natural daughter of James Craggs, secretary of state, was born in the parish of St. George, Hanover Square, 8 July 1727. In company with Philip Stanhope, the illegitimate son of Lord Chesterfield, he travelled through Holland, Germany, and Switzerland, under the charge of the Rev. Walter Harte. On his return through France he met Lord Charlemont, who found that Eliot's 'excellent understanding, cultivated and improved by the best education, and animated by a mind of the most pleasing cast, rendered him the most agreeable of companions,' and in Hardy's 'Memoirs of Charlemont,' i. 61–8, is a long account of a visit which the young men paid to Montesquieu at his seat near Bordeaux. Among the manuscripts at Port Eliot are numerous letters written by Eliot during this period to his father, twenty letters from the father to his son, ten from Harte, half a dozen from Lord Chesterfield, and three from Philip Stanhope at Leipzig to Eliot in England (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 1st Rep. p. 41). He inherited the family estates, on the death of his father through consumption, on 19 Nov. 1748, and he married at St. James's, Westminster, on 25 Sept. 1756, Catherine, sole child and heiress of Edward Elliston of Guestingthorpe, Essex, by his wife Catherine Gibbon. Mrs. Eliot was a first cousin of Gibbon, the historian, 'and their three sons,' says Gibbon, 'are my nearest male relations on the father's side.' Eliot was possessed of vast borough influence in Cornwall. According to Bentham, who made his acquaintance at Bowood in 1781, when Eliot had been connected in politics with Lord Shelburne for sixteen years, he was 'knight of the shire and puts in seven borough members for Cornwall.' The constituencies of Liskeard, St. Germans, and Grampound were at this time entirely under his control, and among his nominees were Philip Stanhope, Samuel Salt (immortalised in Charles Lamb's 'Essays of Elia'), Gibbon, and Bryan Edwards. Stanhope was brought in for Liskeard in 1754, 'owing to Mr. Eliot's friendship, in the most friendly manner imaginable,' but his return for St. Germans in 1761 was attended 'de mauvaise grâce,' though he 'might have done it at first in a friendly and handsome manner,' and the price paid on the second occasion was 2,000*l.* Gibbon's election was also an act of 'private friendship, though, as it turned out, much to Eliot's regret.' Eliot himself sat for St. Germans from 1748 to 1768, Liskeard from 1768 to 1775, and for the county of Cornwall from 1775 to 1784, when he was created Baron Eliot of St. Germans (30 Jan. 1784). In 1751 he was appointed receiver-general for the Prince of Wales in the duchy of Cornwall, a lucrative post estimated at 2,000*l.* per annum, and from January 1760 to March 1776 he was a commissioner for the board of trade and plantations. The ministry of North was supported by him in the early stages of

the American war, but in March 1776 he voted against the employment of the Hessian troops, and resigned his position at the board of trade. Gibbon, like his patron in politics, supported the Tory ministry at first, and continued to vote with them until the dissolution in 1781, when 'Mr. Eliot was deeply engaged in the measures of opposition, and the electors of Liskeard are commonly of the same opinion as Mr. Eliot.' Seven letters from Gibbon to Eliot, two of which are in defence of his parliamentary conduct, are at Port Eliot (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 1st Rep. p. 41). It is mentioned in Hansard's 'Parl. Hist.' xx. 621, to Eliot's credit, that when it was proposed to vest in the two universities the sole right of printing almanacks, Carnan, a bookseller, petitioned against the measure, and Erskine spoke in support of the petition with such success that although Eliot had come up from Cornwall at the request of the chancellor of Oxford University to support the bill, he was converted to the opposite side through Erskine's arguments, and publicly acknowledged it in the lobby. The manor of Charlton in Kent came to him through his descent from Craggs in 1765, and on 15 April 1789 he assumed by sign-manual the name and arms of that family. He died at Port Eliot 17 Feb. 1804, and his wife died on 23 Feb. They were both buried at St. Germans on 1 March. The Eliots were among the earliest patrons of Reynolds, and Lord Eliot was 'one of Sir Joshua's most familiar and valued friends,' to whom he sat for his portrait in March 1781 and January 1782, and by whom Lady Eliot's portrait, a kit-cat, was painted in January 1786. He belonged to the Literary Club, and several of his sayings are recorded in 'Boswell.' He brought under Johnson's notice the account of Lord Peterborough in Captain Carleton's 'Memoirs,' and the introduction was repaid with the remark: 'I did not think a young lord could have mentioned to me a book in English history that was not known to me.' Bentham described him as 'a modest, civil, good kind of man, sensible enough, but without those pretensions which one would expect to find in a man whose station in his country is so commanding and political influence so great. He is modest enough in his conversation about politics, but desponding. He says he scarce ever looks into a paper, nor does he, for fear of ill news.' Several of his letters are among the manuscripts of Lord Lansdowne (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 6th Rep. p. 238).

[Gibbon's Memoirs (1827 ed.), i. 16, 57, 213, 226–7, ii. 75, 123, 125, 138; Chesterfield's Letters (1845 ed.), ii. 355, 364, iv. 337, 394–5, v. 449–50; Bentham's Life (Works x.), 96, 97, 101; Taylor's Sir Joshua Reynolds, ii. 343, 387, 431, 499; Boswell (Hill's ed.), i. 479, iii. 54, iv. 78–9, 326, 332–4; Walpole's Journals, 1771–83, ii. 26; Lysons's Environs, iv. 331, 333, 342; Boase and Courtney's Bibl. Cornub. i. 137, iii. 1171; Geneology of Eliot and Craggs, Miscell. Geneal. and Herald. ii. 44, and privately printed 1868.]

W. P. C.

ELIOT, EDWARD GRANVILLE, third Earl of St. Germans (1798–1877), diplomatist, was the only son of William, second earl of St. Germans, by his first wife, Lady Georgiana Augusta Leveson-Gower, fourth daughter of the first Marquis of Stafford. He was born 29 Aug. 1798, was educated at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, and was created honorary LL.D. of Dublin in 1843. In January 1824 Lord Eliot, by which name he was known till 1845, entered parliament as member for Liskeard, which borough he continued to represent until the passing of the Reform Bill in 1832. Canning appointed him lord of the treasury in his brief administration of 1827. He had been appointed secretary of legation at Madrid in 1823, and at Lisbon in 1824 (Doyle, *Baronage*). In 1834 he was sent to Spain as envoy extraordinary. The Carlist war was then raging, and Eliot concluded an agreement with the two belligerent forces, by which prisoners on both sides were to be treated according to the laws of civilised war. This treaty, known as the 'Eliot Convention,' effectually put an end to the sanguinary system of reprisals. Within a month of the conclusion of the treaty it was the means of saving the lives of more than six hundred of the royalist troops. The populace of Madrid was furious, believing that it might be the commencement of a policy 'to protocolise' Spain in the manner of Belgium. Upon his return to England in 1837 Eliot was returned to parliament for East Cornwall, which he continued to represent until 1845. England having permitted Spain to enlist soldiers within her territories, Eliot moved an address in the House of Commons in 1838, condemning the policy which had been sanctioned by Lord Palmerston. His speech was much applauded, but the motion was defeated on a division taken by surprise. In 1841 Eliot, who was a moderate whig in politics, was appointed by Sir Robert Peel chief secretary for Ireland, then in a very disturbed state. Eliot in the session of 1843 introduced an arms bill, which required the registration of firearms, and restricted the importation of arms and ammunition. The measure was obstinately contested at every stage, but eventually became

law. Eliot often addressed the house on Irish questions, with the respect even of opponents. In January 1845 Eliot resigned the Irish chief secretaryship, and on the death of his father succeeded to the peerage as Earl St. Germans. He was appointed postmaster-general by Sir Robert Peel, and held that office till the fall of Peel's administration. The Earl of Aberdeen, on becoming prime minister in December 1852, appointed him lord-lieutenant of Ireland. He held the post during Lord Aberdeen's premiership. He received the queen and the prince consort in 1853 on the opening of the Great Exhibition of Dublin. On 16 Feb. 1855 Palmerston acceded to office as premier, and St. Germans retained in the new government the post of Irish viceroy, but on the reconstruction of the ministry a few days later, retired from office. After his return from Ireland St. Germans was for several years lord steward of the household. He was afterwards, as long as his health permitted, the queen's confidential adviser at all critical periods, and especially on family matters. He accompanied the Prince of Wales on his tour through Canada and the United States in 1860. He never ceased to take a deep interest in public affairs. Though he acted with the liberals on political questions generally, his advice was frequently sought by leaders on the opposite side. He declined to join in the 'No Popery' agitation in 1850, and published his reasons for objecting to it. He spoke seldom, but was generally respected for his fairness and ability; and he was a good landlord to his tenantry in Cornwall. He was deputy-lieutenant of the county (1841) and special deputy-warden of the Stannaries (1852). He died 7 Oct. 1877.

In 1824 he married Lady Jemima Cornwallis, third daughter and coheiress of Charles, second and last marquis Cornwallis, by his wife, the Lady Louisa Gordon, daughter and coheiress of Alexander, fourth duke of Gordon. He had issue three sons and one daughter. Granville Charles Cornwallis, the second son, was a captain in the Coldstream guards, and was killed at Inkerman, 5 Nov. 1854. William Gordon Cornwallis (born 14 Dec. 1829), the eldest son, who became fourth Earl of St. Germans, was summoned to the House of Lords in 1870 in his father's barony of Eliot; was engaged in the diplomatic service till 1865; was M.P. for Devonport from 1866 to 1868, and died 19 March 1881. His brother, Henry Cornwallis Eliot, became fifth earl.

[Ann. Reg. 1877; Times, 8 Oct. 1877; Western Weekly News, 13 Oct. 1877; Hansard's Parliamentary Debates.] G. B. S.

ELIOT, FRANCIS PERCEVAL (1756?–1818), writer on finance, born about 1756, entered the civil service, and was at the time of his death and for many years previously one of the commissioners of audit at Somerset House. He took a very great interest in the volunteer yeomanry service, was successively major and colonel of the Staffordshire volunteer cavalry, and wrote, with reference to that movement, 'Six Letters on the subject of the Armed Yeomanry,' 1794; new edition, 1797. Eliot died at Portman Street, London, on 23 Aug. 1818. He was married and had a large family. He wrote: 1. 'Demonstration, or Financial Remarks, with occasional Observations on Political Occurrences,' 1807. 2. 'Observations on the Fallacy of the supposed Depreciation of the Paper Currency of the Kingdom, with Reasons for dissenting from the Report of the Bullion Committee,' 1811; new edition, with answers to criticisms, same year. 3. 'Letters on the Political and Financial Situation of the British Empire in the years 1814, 1815, and 1816,' addressed to the Earl of Liverpool, and published in the 'Pamphleteer' of those dates. Eliot was engaged at the time of his death in writing largely for the 'Ægis,' a weekly paper in which he was interested.

[Gent. Mag. October 1818, p. 378; Observations, p. 3; Brit. Mus. Cat.] F. W–T.

ELIOT, GEORGE. [See CROSS, MARY ANN.]

ELIOT, SIR JOHN (1592–1632), patriot, the son of Richard Eliot and his wife Bridget (Carswell) of Port Eliot, near St. Germans in Cornwall, was born on or shortly before 20 April 1592. The impetuosity which was the distinguishing mark of his parliamentary career revealed itself in a boyish outbreak, in which he wounded a neighbour, Mr. Moyle, who had complained to his father of his extravagance. It was also in keeping with his placable disposition that he should be sobered by the incident, and should have craved forgiveness for the wrong which he had done. On 4 Dec. 1607 he matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford (BOASE, *Reg. Coll. Exon.* lxix.), where he remained three years, and though he did not take a degree, his parliamentary speeches showed the thoroughness with which he had conducted his studies. His religion was deep-seated, thoroughly protestant in tone, but not careful to take offence at the small ceremonial scandals which vexed the soul of the ordinary puritan, as long as he had reason to think that they did not cover an attempt to reintroduce papal doctrines and practices.

After leaving the university Eliot betook himself to one of the inns of court to master so much of the law as was then considered a necessary part of the education of a gentleman. He afterwards travelled on the continent, where he met George Villiers, then an unknown youth, and took great pleasure in his society. On his return to England in the winter of 1611, he married Rhadagund, daughter of Richard Gedie of Trebursye, Cornwall. In 1614 Eliot sat in the Addled parliament for St. Germans. In 1618 he was knighted, and in 1619, by the favour of the companion of his continental travels, who had now become Marquis of Buckingham and lord high admiral, he was appointed vice-admiral of Devon. He did not sit in the parliament of 1621. In 1623, during the absence of his patron in Spain, he first came into collision with the court. He arrested a pirate named Nutt. Nutt, however, had a protector in Sir George Calvert, the secretary of state, and Eliot was committed to the Marshalsea on some trumped-up charges connected with the arrest. He was only liberated on 23 Dec., more than two months after the return of Buckingham, who had now become a duke.

In the parliament of 1624 Eliot sat for the Cornish borough of Newport. His maiden speech on 27 Feb. at once revealed a power of oratory unlike anything which had been heard before in the House of Commons. It also revealed an independence of character which was less unusual. Eliot sympathised deeply with Buckingham's warlike policy directed against Spain, but he had an idealist's reverence for the House of Commons as the depository of the wisdom of the nation. From first to last he was vehement in sustaining its privileges, sometimes even at the expense of what might at the time seem graver interests. He now asked that the question of freedom of speech which had been raised in the last days of the parliament of 1621 might be finally settled. The house was intent on other matters, and Eliot's proposal was shelved in a committee.

Eliot, as might have been expected, gave his voice for a breach with Spain. On 24 April he called for thanks to the king and prince on their declaration that there should be no conditions for the catholics in the French marriage treaty. Before the prorogation he advocated the impeachment of Middlesex. He was still an adherent of Buckingham, and was marked out for a place in his cortège if he had, as was intended, gone to France, shortly after the accession of Charles I, to fetch the future queen, the Princess Henrietta Maria. On 1 April 1625 he wrote to the duke to assure him that he hoped to become 'wholly devoted to the contemplation of his excellence.' In the parliament of 1625, the first parliament of the new reign, Eliot again represented Newport. On 23 June he spoke for the purity and unity of religion, arguing for the enforcement of the laws against the catholics. It was probably the tolerance shown by Charles to the catholics, in defiance of his promise made to the last parliament, which roused Eliot's suspicions of his government. He took a strong part against Wentworth in the case of a disputed election. On 8 July, when it was known that Buckingham had advised Charles to ask for a grant of money for the war in addition to the two subsidies which had been already voted, Eliot was chosen to remonstrate with the duke, evidently as a person who was still on good terms with him. The arguments which he used to induce Buckingham to abandon the demand which had been made for further subsidies avoided the main point at issue, the necessity or otherwise of a large grant for the service of the war, and may, therefore, give rise to a suspicion that though Eliot already shared the general opinion as to Buckingham's incompetency as a war minister, he did not like to tell him this to his face. On 6 Aug., after the adjournment to Oxford, he appeared for the last time as a mediator, declaring his distrust in a war policy which extended to Denmark, Savoy, Germany, and France, but throwing the blame of the late miscarriages, not on Buckingham, but on the navy commissioners. An attempt which was subsequently made to induce Buckingham to make concessions broke down on the duke's persistence, with Charles's support, in refusing to admit to the direction of affairs counsellors who might have the confidence of the House of Commons. It was this refusal which marks Eliot's final breach with him. Yet, though in the warm debates which followed he had taken up some notes of Sir R. Cotton, and had worked them up into a speech of bitter invective against the duke, he allowed his words to remain unspoken, and contented himself with watching events during the remainder of the session (see GARDINER, *Hist. of England*, 1603–42, v. 425).

In the winter which followed, Eliot was witness of the miserable condition of the men who had returned from the Cadiz voyage, and who, ill-clothed and half-starved, crowded the streets of Plymouth. Accordingly, when he was elected to the new parliament which met in 1626, this time as member for St. Germans, he came to it entirely estranged from the man whom he had for many years regarded with affection. Eliot was not one whose feelings were ever at a moderate heat. He had the

oratorical temperament, and as soon as he distrusted Buckingham he believed him capable of the worst crimes. He could not conceive him as he really was, incapable and vain, yet animated with a sincere desire to serve his country in displaying his own power. He set him down as a traitor who was prepared deliberately to sacrifice national interests in order to enrich and aggrandise himself and his kindred.

Eliot's conviction of Buckingham's misdemeanors was increased by the circumstances under which the parliament of 1626 opened. Charles, in order to rid himself of opposition, had kept at a distance from Westminster those among the members of the last parliament who had most severely criticised his policy by naming them sheriffs of their respective counties. It was therefore upon Eliot, who had been allowed to come to parliament, as having taken no part in that criticism, that the leadership of the new house fell. He began by calling for inquiry into the causes of the recent disaster, and when the committee which conducted the examination came upon traces of the misdeeds of the duke, he was inclined to exaggerate them, sometimes from mere want of knowledge of the circumstances under which Buckingham had acted. He soon came to the conclusion that the favourite, having dragged England into a war with Spain, was now about to drag her into a war with France, simply in order to fill his purse with the tenths of prize goods which were the perquisite of the lord high admiral. On 27 March he made a furious attack on Buckingham, and Charles, having intervened, persuaded the house on 4 April to present a remonstrance, asserting its right to question the highest subjects of the crown. It was a claim to render ministerial responsibility once more a reality, and thereby indirectly to make parliament supreme. He had already persuaded the house to vote a resolution granting subsidies, but to postpone the bringing in of the bill which alone could give legality to the resolution, and thus to dangle before the king's eyes the expectation of receiving supplies of war in order to induce him to abandon Buckingham.

As Charles was not to be persuaded, the impeachment of Buckingham, which had long been threatened, took its course. It was carried to the lords on 8 May by eight managers, of whom Eliot was one. It was on Eliot that devolved on 10 May the duty of summing up the charges, and in doing so he compared Buckingham to Sejanus. On the 11th Eliot was sent to the Tower, together with Sir Dudley Digges. The commons refused to proceed to business till their members were released. Digges was set free on the 16th, and Eliot on the 19th. They were the last members ever imprisoned for words spoken in parliament. As Charles could not stop the impeachment in any other way, he dissolved parliament on 15 June.

When the session was ended Eliot was dismissed from the justiceship of the peace and the vice-admiralty of Devon, and in 1627 was imprisoned in the Gatehouse for refusing to pay his share of the forced loan. He was liberated when it became evident that another parliament must be summoned, and when Charles's third parliament met, 17 March 1628, Eliot sat in it as member for the county of Cornwall. He at once joined in the cry against arbitrary taxation, and made his voice heard from time to time, though during the earlier part of the session the house was more inclined to follow Wentworth, who, though equally firm in his resolution to procure a removal of the subjects' grievances, was less incisive than Eliot in his mode of dealing with the king. On 5 May Wentworth's leadership came to an end, upon Charles's refusal to concede his demands, and Eliot then came to the front, and joined Coke and the lawyers in promoting the Petition of Right, and in refusing to agree to anything short of its full acceptance by the king. When, after the king's first answer, that acceptance appeared unlikely, Eliot called upon the house to draw up a remonstrance, and, being interrupted by the speaker in a hostile allusion to Buckingham, refused to continue a speech in which he was not free to express all his mind. The king for once gave way, and on 7 June gave his assent to the Petition of Right. During the short remainder of the session Eliot continued the assault on Buckingham.

In the session of 1629, after Buckingham's murder, Eliot led the attack upon the Arminians and ceremonialists, who were, as he held, unprotestantising the doctrine and the services of the church. He pointed out that those who professed the opinions against which the House of Commons protested had been chosen for preferment in the church, and he proposed to meet the one-sided favour of the king by an equally one-sided proscription by parliament. He found, however, that it was easier to point out who were to be excluded from office in the church than it was to define the doctrines which were to be alone accepted. The house followed him in summoning to its bar some of the inculpated persons; but before they appeared on the scene a new question arose. The claim of the king to levy provisionally tonnage and poundage without consent of parliament was disputed, and while Pym wished to discuss the legal

question, Eliot preferred first to take in hand a question of privilege which had arisen by the seizure of the goods of a member of the house who had refused to pay the duties. The officers of the customs who had effected the seizure were summoned to the bar, but the king intervened, and directed the adjournment of the house, that an attempt might be made in the interval to discover a compromise. On his direction of a second adjournment on 2 March, the speaker was held down in his chair, while Eliot, amidst increasing tumult, read out three resolutions which were intended to call the attention of the country to the king's proceedings in respect to religion and taxation. The resolutions were actually put by Holles, just as the king arrived to prorogue parliament.

On 4 March Eliot, with eight other members, was sent to the Tower, and on the 10th parliament was dissolved. When on the 18th Eliot was examined as to his conduct, he replied: 'I refuse to answer, because I hold that it is against the privilege of parliament to speak of anything which was done in the house.' Eliot's position was that he was accountable to the house only, and that no power existed with a constitutional right to inquire into his conduct in it. Charles struck at Eliot not merely as a political antagonist, but as the assailant of Buckingham, and in his anger described him as 'an outlawed man, desperate in mind and fortune.'

With all their wish to strike at Eliot and his fellows, the crown lawyers had some difficulty in discovering the best method of procedure. They did not like to accuse them of words spoken in the house, and it was not till October that Attorney-general Heath determined to bring an information against Eliot, Holles, and Valentine in the court of king's bench. On 29 Oct. Eliot was removed to the Marshalsea, a prison specially connected with that court. On 26 Jan. 1630 the three appeared at the bar of the king's bench. The charge against them was not that they had spoken certain words, but that they had formed a conspiracy to resist the king's lawful order, to calumniate the ministers of the crown, and to assault the speaker. The court decided that it had jurisdiction in the case. Eliot simply continued to refuse to acknowledge that jurisdiction, and on 12 Feb. was sentenced, in his absence through illness, to a fine of 2,000*l.*

Eliot was once more sent back to the Tower. A word of acknowledgment that he was in the wrong would have given him his liberty, but for him to make that acknowledgment was to surrender those privileges of parliament which in his eyes were equivalent to the liberties of the nation. He solaced himself in his confinement by writing an account of the first parliament of Charles I, under the title of the 'Negotium Posterorum,' and a political-philosophical treatise, which he styled 'The Monarchy of Man.' Eliot was not a republican. His ideal state was one in which the king governed with very extended powers, but in which he received enlightenment by constantly listening to the advice of parliament. Eliot's revolutionary work, in short, was rather in tendency than in deliberate judgment. The result of his action, if carried on by his successors, would be the subordination of the crown to parliament; but he was an enthusiastic orator rather than a logical thinker, and he was himself unconscious of the complete change in the balance of force which his genius was creating. It was left for Pym to systematise that which had been sketched out by Eliot.

The spring of 1632 saw Eliot in the beginning of a consumption. In a letter to Hampden, written on 29 March, he expressed his abounding cheerfulness in contemplation of God's goodness towards him. In October he petitioned for leave to go into the country for the benefit of his health. As he still refused to acknowledge that he had erred, Charles rejected his petition, and on 27 Nov. he died. The implacable king closed his ears to a request of his son for permission to transport his corpse to Port Eliot. 'Let Sir John Eliot,' he wrote on the petition, 'be buried in the church of that parish where he died.' By his wife, who died in 1628, Eliot had five sons and four daughters. John, the eldest son, was M.P. for St. Germans from 1660 till 1678, and died in 1685. Elizabeth, the eldest daughter, married Colonel Nathaniel Fiennes.

The following works by Eliot were privately printed for the first time from manuscripts at Port Eliot by Dr. Grosart: 1. 'The Monarchie of Man,' 1879. 2. 'An Apology for Socrates (being a vindication of Sir J. E. by himself),' and 'Negotium Posterorum,' 1881. 3. 'De Jure Majestatis, a Political Treatise of Government,' and the 'Letter-book of Sir John Eliot,' 1882.

[The materials for Eliot's Life are to be found in Forster's Life of Sir John Eliot. For criticisms on that work, see Gardiner's Hist. of England, 1603–42, vols. v–vii. passim.] S. R. G.

ELIOT, JOHN (1604–1690), styled 'the Indian Apostle' (T. Thorowgood, *Jews in America*, 1660, p. 24) and by Winslow 'the Indian evangelist,' was born either at Widford, Hertfordshire, where he was baptised on 5 Aug. 1604, or at Nazing, where his father

lived (W. Winters, *Memorials of the Pilgrim Fathers*, 1882, p. 26). He was the son of Bennett Eliot, a yeoman holding land in the parishes of Ware, Widford, Hunsdon, and Eastwick in the same county, who bequeathed by will, dated 5 Nov. 1621, 8*l.* of the profits of these lands for the maintenance of his son John at Cambridge University (*ib.* pp. 39–42). John Eliot entered as a pensioner at Jesus College, 20 March 1619, and took his degree in 1622. He was for some years usher in a school at Little Baddow, near Chelmsford, kept by the Rev. Thomas Hooker, afterwards (1633) pastor of the First Church at Cambridge, Massachusetts. Cotton Mather owned a manuscript account of this school written by Eliot, whose leaning towards nonconformity commenced under Hooker's administration (*Magnalia Christi Americana*, 1702, bk. iii. p. 59). Eliot had taken orders in the church of England, but his opinions led him to quit his native country. He landed at Boston in New England on 4 Nov. 1631 (John Winthrop, *Hist. of New England*, Boston, 1853, i. 76), going over in the same ship with Governor Winthrop's wife and children. Three brothers and three sisters went with him either then or shortly afterwards. 'He adjoyned to the church at Boston, and there exercised in the absens of Mr. Wilson, the pastor of that church, who had gone back to England' (Eliot's own 'Church Record,' reprinted in *Report of the Boston Record Commissioners*, Doc. 114, 1880, and portions in *New England Hist. and Genealog. Register*, vol. xxxiii. 1879). He was so much liked that 'though Boston laboured all they could, both with the congregation of Roxbury and with Mr. Eliot himself, alleging their want of him, and the covenant between them, &c., yet he could not be diverted from accepting the call of Roxbury' (Winthrop, *History*, i. 111). Before leaving England Eliot was engaged to be married to Hanna Mumford or Mountford, who followed him a year after his arrival in the colony, and to whom he was married on 4 Sept. 1632, or rather October, says Savage (*Genealog. Dict.* ii. 109). This was the first marriage recorded in Roxbury. On 5 Nov. following he was established a 'teacher' of the church at Roxbury, an office he continued until his death, and at once began to manifest that love of learning, devotion to religious obligations, and chivalric ardour for the temporal and spiritual welfare of the Indians, which always distinguished him. In 1634, having censured the conduct of the colonial government in concluding a treaty with the Pequots without consulting the whole community, he was called upon publicly to retract his observations. He was a witness against the religious enthusiast, Mrs. Hutchinson, on her trial in November 1637 (T. Hutchinson, *History of the Province of Massachusetts Bay from* 1628 to 1749, 1768, ii. 494). With Richard Mather and his colleague, Thomas Weld, he helped to prepare the English metrical version of the Psalms, printed by Stephen Daye [q. v.] in 1640, and known as the 'Bay Psalm Book,' the first book printed in New England.

Eliot states that he set himself to learn the Indian language with the assistance of 'a pregnant-witted young man, who had been a servant in an English house, who pretty well understood his own language, and had a clear pronunciation' (*The Indian Grammar begun*, 1666, p. 66). He studied two years before he allowed himself to preach. His first pastoral visit to the Indians was on 28 Oct. 1646, at a place afterwards called Nonantum, on the borders of Newton and Watertown, Massachusetts. Here he delivered a long sermon in the native dialect, but prayed in English. Three other meetings were held, and the Indians are reported to have taken a lively interest in the proceedings. A practical step towards the civilisation of his converts was taken by Eliot in establishing settlements, giving them industrial occupations, clearings, houses, and clothes. They ultimately enjoyed some kind of self-government, with the comforts and securities of white citizens. He thought it 'absolutely necessary to carry on civility with religion.' The work was regarded with approval by his brother ministers, and money to found schools was sent by well-wishers even from England. An order of the home parliament was passed on 17 March 1647 requiring the committee on foreign plantations to prepare an ordinance 'for the encouragement and advancement of learning and piety in New England' (Francis, p. 132). An ordinance was passed on 27 July 1649 for the advancement of civilisation and christianity among the Indians, and 'A Corporation for the Promoting and Propagating the Gospel among the Indians of New England' was instituted. The first township of 'praying Indians' was at Natick, where in 1651 a considerable number were established. A dozen more settlements were founded under the care of Eliot, who sought for the support of the general court in his proceedings. While fulfilling his duties at Roxbury he visited Natick once a fortnight, riding horseback across open country. He begged clothing and other necessaries for his pupils. A water-drinker and abhorrer of smoking himself, he did not forbid his converts either wine or tobacco. The papooses always found small gifts in his deep pockets. The medicine men

and sachems were hostile, and King Philip refused to entertain the English missionaries. A considerable sum of money was transmitted to America from the corporation in London. Salaries were paid to preachers (Eliot in 1662 receiving 50*l.*), an Indian college erected, schools founded, and the expenses of printing translations defrayed by the corporation, which was kept informed by Eliot of his progress (see letters in *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, November 1879, and Birch, *Life of Boyle*, 1772, pp. ccv–xiv). After the Restoration, 'the corporation being dead in law,' Robert Boyle procured a charter re-establishing its rights (Birch, *Life*, p. lxviii). The history of the missionary labours of Eliot and others is detailed in the series of 'Indian tracts' described below.

'The Christian Commonwealth' was printed in London by a friend of the author in 1659. On 18 March 1660 the governor and council in New England found it 'full of seditious principles and notions. . . especially against the government established in their native country' (Francis, p. 210). Eliot recanted before the court, which suppressed the book. The first Indian church was founded at Natick in 1660; the ecclesiastical organisation continued until the death of the last native pastor in 1716.

All this time the great work of Eliot's life, the translation of the Bible, was slowly progressing, in spite of his missionary labours and family cares. His earliest published volume in the Indian language was a catechism, printed in 1653, and five years later a translation of some psalms in metre. The two books are described by Thomas as having been printed at Cambridge by Green, but no copy of either can be traced (*Printing*, i. 65, 66, ii. 311, 312). The version of the whole Bible in the dialect of the Massachusetts Indians was finished by December 1658, and the corporation in London was at the expense of putting the first sheet of the New Testament into type before 7 Sept. 1659. Samuel Green, successor to Stephen Daye, was the first printer, and was afterwards helped by Marmaduke Johnson. By 5 Sept. 1661 the New Testament was completed, and a copy sent by the commissioners to Charles II and others. Two years later the whole Bible was completed, being the first ever printed on the American continent. The commissioners directed that a metrical version of the Psalms should be added. There is a page of 'Catechism' or rules for holy living. The paper is of good quality, of 'pot quarto' size, the type 'full-faced bourgeois on brevier body' (Thomas, ii. 314). Seventeen years afterwards a new edition was called for, and with the help of the Rev. John Cotton of Plymouth Eliot undertook a thorough revision. Green, the printer, and a native journeyman began the New Testament in 1680, and finished it about the end of the following year. The Old Testament was in course of printing from 1682 to 1685. The Psalms and 'Catechism' are included as in the first edition. It was produced at a cheaper price than its predecessor. Some well-used copies are preserved bearing the names of long-forgotten Indian owners. Nine hundred pounds were forwarded by the corporation towards the expenses, to which Eliot himself contributed part of his modest salary. This marvellous monument of laborious piety is of considerable linguistic value, although no one using the language has been living for many years. The first edition is very rare, and good copies have sold for over 200*l.* The second edition is also eagerly sought for by American collectors. Baxter states that after Eliot had sent the king first the New Testament and then the whole Bible in the Indian's language, 'next he would print my "Call to the Unconverted" and the "Practice of Piety." But Mr. Boyle sent him word it would be better taken here if the "Practice of Piety" were printed before anything of mine' (*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*, 1696, pp. 290–1). The translation of Baxter's 'Call' was, however, printed about the middle of 1664. An abridged version of Bayly's 'Practice of Piety,' a work of extraordinary popularity in its original form, appeared in 1665, as well as Eliot's 'Communion of Churches,' defending the utility of councils or synods; 'although a few copies of this small script are printed,' the preface states 'yet it is not published, only committed privately to some godly and able hands.'

With his sons John (1636–1668) and Joseph (1638–1694) (Sibley, *Harvard Graduates*, Cambr. 1873, i. 476, 530), who helped him in his versions, he had long talked over a proposal to put the dialect of the Indians into grammatical form, and, upon the suggestion of Boyle, printed, in 1666, 'The Indian Grammar begun,' described in the dedication to him and the corporation as 'an essay unto this difficult service . . . some bones and ribs preparatory at least for such a work. It is not worthy the name of a grammar.' The 'Indian Primer' (1669) and 'Logick Primer' (1672) were written for the native proselytes. In 1674 the number of 'praying Indians' was estimated at 3,600 (N. Morton, *New England's Memorial*, Boston, 1826, pp. 407–15). During King Philip's war (1675–6) many fell victims to the suspicion both of their own countrymen as well as of the colonists, although they fought on the side of the English. The progress of christianity among them never

recovered from the blow. In the autumn of 1675 the Natick Indians were removed to Deer Island, 'patiently, humbly, and piously, without complaining against ye English,' says Eliot. In May 1678, when the exiles returned to Natick, one-fourth of all the natives in New England were considered to have been civilised, but their extinction was rapid after Eliot's death. One of his latest acts was to give by deed in 1689 seventy-five acres of land for the teaching of Indians and negroes in Roxbury. Down to 1733 all the town officers of Natick were Indians, who thirty years later were reduced to a single family. At the celebration in 1846 of the two hundredth anniversary of Eliot's first service one young girl was the sole surviving native representative.

'The Harmony of the Gospels' (1678) is a life of Jesus Christ with practical remarks. Eliot's tender solicitude for the natives was unbounded. For those taken prisoners in war he had the same active kindness as for his own converts. Writing to Boyle, 27 Nov. 1683, he requested him to use his influence to redeem some enslaved captives who had been carried to Tangiers (*Life*, p. ccx). He was visited by John Dunton [q. v.] in 1685, who states, 'He was pleased to receive me with abundance of respect' (*Life and Errors*, i. 115), and of the Indians, 'I have been an eye-witness of the wonderful success which the gospel of peace has had amongst them' (*ib.* p. 121). Leusden dedicated his Hebrew-English Psalter (1688) to Eliot. Mather, in giving Leusden at Utrecht, 12 July 1687, an account of Eliot's labours, describes him as formerly preaching once a fortnight, 'but now he is weakned with labours and old age, being in the 84th year of his age, and preacheth not to the Indians oftner than once in two months' (*Magnalia*, 1702, bk. iii. pp. 194–5). Eliot himself says to Boyle, 7 July 1688, 'I am drawing home' (Birch, p. ccxiii). The latest of his translations, that of Shepard's 'Sincere Convert,' was printed in 1689, and revised for the press by the Rev. Grindall Rawson, an active missionary among the Indians. Eliot's last words were 'Welcome joy.' He died at Roxbury 20 May 1690, aged 86, and was buried in the parish tomb in the old burying-ground. Monuments to his memory have been erected in the Forest Hills cemetery, Roxbury, in the Indian cemetery at South Natick, at Canton, Mass., and at Newton, near the site of his first Nonantum preaching. His 'dear, faithful, pious, prudent, prayerful wife,' as he called her, died three years before him. They had six children, a daughter and five sons, of whom one alone survived the parents (Savage, *Genealogical Dictionary*, ii. 109–10). This was the Rev. Joseph Eliot, minister of Guilford, Conn., from 1664 to 1694, who graduated at Harvard in 1658, and whose son, Jared (1685–1763), is known as a theologian, physician, agriculturist, author, and friend of Franklin. Other American descendants of John Eliot are Fitzgreene Halleck, the poet (1790–1867), Professor Elisha Mitchell, geologist (1793–1857), Charles Wyllys Elliott, author (1817–1883), and Ethelinda Eliot Beers, poetess (1827–1879).

The authenticity of the portrait belonging to the Whiting family is doubtful. A good engraving from it is in the 'Century Magazine,' May 1883. A chair which belonged to Eliot is preserved in the First Church in Dorchester, Mass. A bureau considered to have been his is described in 'New England Hist. and Gen. Register,' October 1855 and January 1858. The position of his estate and house in Roxbury is pointed out by Drake (*Town of Roxbury*, 1878, pp. 174–5).

'Since the death of the apostle Paul,' proclaims Everett, 'a nobler, truer, and warmer spirit than John Eliot never lived' (*Address at Bloody Brook*, in *Orations*, Boston, 1836, p. 614). This is no modern sentimental rhetoric. Eliot's contemporaries speak of him in enthusiastic terms. 'He that would write of Eliot,' says Mather, 'must write of charity or say nothing;' and Baxter, 'There was no man on earth whom I honour'd above him' (*Magnalia*, bk. iii. p. 210). He was the first to carry the gospel to the red man, and perhaps the earliest who championed the negro. Strangers with whom he came in contact spoke of the peculiar charm of his manners. He united fervent piety and love of learning to burning enthusiasm for evangelisation, these qualities being tempered with worldly wisdom and shrewd common sense. Taking into consideration the nature of his life, his literary activity is remarkable. No name in the early history of New England is more revered than his. Eliot was truly of a saintly type, without fanaticism, spiritual pride, or ambition.

The following is a list of the 'Indian tracts' already referred to. Most of them contain letters of Eliot, and some are wholly from his pen: 1. 'Good Newes from New England, by E[dward] W[inslow],' London, 1624, 4to. 2. 'New England's First Fruits,' London, 1643, 4to (anonymous). 3. 'The Day-breaking, if not the Sun-rising, of the Gospel with the Indians in New England,' London, 1647, 4to (erroneously ascribed to Eliot, says Francis, p. 346). 4. 'The Cleare Sun-shine of the Gospel breaking forth upon the Indians in New England, by T. Shepard,' London, 1648, 4to (contains letter of Eliot;

reprinted in T. Shepard's 'Works,' vol. ii.) 5. 'The Glorious Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England, by E. Winslow,' London, 1649, 4to (with three letters by Eliot). 6. 'The Light appearing more and more towards the Perfect Day, published by H. Whitfield,' London, 1651, 4to (contains five letters from Eliot). 7. 'Strength out of Weakness, or a Glorious Manifestation of the further Progresse of the Gospel,' London, 1652, 4to (the first published by the 'Corporation;' three editions in the same year; with two letters from Eliot). 8. 'Tears of Repentance, or a further Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel, related by Mr. Eliot and Mr. Mayhew,' London, 1653, 4to (published by the 'Corporation'). 9. 'A late and further Manifestation of the Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England, related by Mr. John Eliot,' London, 1655, 4to. 10. 'A further Accompt of the Progresse of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England, by J. Eliot,' London, M. Simmons, 1659, 4to ('This tract I have never seen,' Francis, p. 349). 11. 'A further Account of the Progress of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England, being a relation of the Confessions made by several Indians sent out by Mr. J. Eliot,' London, J. Macock, 1660, 4to (not the same as No. 10, unmentioned by Marvin or Dexter, copy in Brit. Mus.) 12. 'A Briefe Narrative of the Progress of the Gospel among the Indians, 1670, given in by Mr. Eliot,' London, 1671, 4to ('a small tract of 11 pp. which I have been unable to find ... it was probably the first publication of the Corporation after their charter was confirmed or renewed by Charles II' (Francis, p. 349, reprinted with introduction by W.T.R. Marvin, Boston, 1868, 4to). 13. 'An Historical Account of the Doings and Sufferings of the Christian Indians in New England in 1675–7' (presented to the 'Corporation' by Daniel Gookin, printed in 'Collections of Amer. Antiq. Soc.,' vol. ii., 1836, contains letter from Eliot). 14. 'A Letter about the Present State of Christianity among the Christianized Indians of New England, written to Sir William Ashhurst, governour of the Corporation,' Boston, 1705, 18mo (this may be added to the series). Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, reprinted in 'Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections,' 1st ser. vol. viii., 2nd ser. vol. ix., 3rd ser. vol. iv., Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, in Sabin's 'Reprints.'

Eliot's other works are: 1. 'A Catechism in the Indian Language,' Cambridge, S. Green, 1653. (No copy of this is known. The same printer issued a second edition of one thousand copies in 1662, and a third or fourth in 1687, all at the expense of the 'Corporation,' see J. H. Trumbull, *Origin and Early Progress of Indian Missions*, Worc. 1874, from *Proceedings of Amer. Antiq. Soc.* No. 61; and I. Thomas, *Printing in America*, 1874, i. 65, &c. ii. 311, 313). 2. 'Psalms in metre in the Indian Language,' Cambridge, 1658 (no copy known; mentioned by Eliot in a note to the 'Corporation,' 28 Dec. 1628, and in the Treasurer's Account, 16 Sept. 1659, see Trumbull, p. 34). 3. 'The Christian Commonwealth, or the Civil Policy of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ, written before the interruption of the government by Mr. John Eliot, teacher of the church of Christ at Roxbury in New England, and now published (after his consent given) by a servor of the season,' London [1659], 4to (see *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.* 3rd ser. vol. ix.) 4. 'The Learned Conjectures of Rev. John Eliot touching the Americans' were included in 'Jews in America,' by T. Thorowgood, London, 1660, 4to. 5. 'A Christian Covenanting Confession' [Cambridge, 1661], small 4to (one page, only two copies known, not alike, see Trumbull, p. 36). 6. 'The New Testament translated into the Indian Language, and ordered to be printed by the Commissioners of the United Colonies in New England at the charge and with the consent of the Corporation in England for the Propagation of the Gospel amongst the Indians in New England,' Cambridge, S. Green and M. Johnson, 1661, 4to (with title-page in English and Indian, 'Wusku Wuttestamentum,' &c., some copies have dedication to Charles II (see Trumbull, pp. 35–6; and Thomas, i. 66 and App.); a second edition of 2,500 copies was printed in 1680–1, at Cambridge, without printer's name, five hundred of them were bound up with the Indian catechism (1 p.) and the remainder issued with the second edition of the complete Bible in 1685). 7. 'Psalms of David in Indian Verse,' Cambridge, 1661–3, 4to (translated from New England version; bound up with No. 8). 8. 'The Holy Bible, containing the Old Testament and the New, translated into the Indian Language, and ordered to be printed by the Commissioners of the United Colonies in New England, at the charge and with the consent of the Corporation in England,' &c., Cambridge, S. Green and M. Johnson, 1663, 4to (with Indian title-page, 'Mamusse Wunneetupanatamwe up-Biblum God,' &c., see Trumbull; O'Callaghan, *American Bibles*; *Hist. Mag.* ii. 306–8, iii. 87–8; a second edition was published at Cambridge by Green in 1685, 4to). 9. 'The Psalter, translated into the Indian Language,' Cambridge, S. Green, 1664, sm. 8vo (150 pp., five hundred copies printed, which Trumbull (p. 38) considers were worked from the forms used for the

Old Testament, and that they were printed in 1663). 10. 'Wehkomaonganooa asquam Peantogig kah asquam Quinnuppegig,' &c., Cambridge, M. Johnson, 1664, 8vo (translation of Baxter's 'Call to the Unconverted,' not one of the one thousand copies printed for the 'Corporation' is known to exist; reissued in 1688). 11. 'Communion of Churches, or the Divine Management of Gospel Churches by the Ordinance of Councils, constituted in order according to the Scriptures,' Cambridge, M. Johnson, 1665, 8vo (very rare; the first American privately printed book). 12. 'Manitowompae Pomantamoonk Sampwshanam Christianoh,' &c., Cambridge, S. Green, 1665, sm. 8vo (translation for the 'Corporation' of Bishop Lewis Bayly's 'Practice of Piety;' again in 1685 and 1687). 13. 'The Book of Genesis and the Gospel of Matthew in the Indian Language,' Cambridge, S. Green, 1665 (mentioned by Thomas (*Printing*. ii. 315), but no copy known). 14. 'The Indian Grammar begun, or an essay to bring the Indian Language into rules,' Cambridge, M. Johnson, 1666, 4to (dedicated to R. Boyle and the 'Corporation,' very scarce, five hundred copies printed; Thomas cannot have seen a copy, as he only (p. 68) mentions an unknown edition of 1664 of about 60 pp.; new edition by P. S. Du Ponceau, Boston, 1822). 15. 'The Indian Primer, or the way of training up youth of India in the knowledge of God,' Cambridge, 1669, 24mo (the only known copy is in the library of the university of Edinburgh, see Trumbull, p. 40). 16. 'Indian Dialogues,' Cambridge, 1671, square 16mo (copies in Bodleian and Lenox Libraries). 17. 'The Logick Primer, some logical notions to initiate the Indians in the knowledge of the rule of reason, and to know how to make use thereof, especially for the instruction of such as are teachers among them, composed for the use of the Praying Indians' [Cambridge] M. J[ohnson], 1672, 32mo (in Indian, with interlinear translation, copies in the Bodleian and the British Museum). 18. 'The Harmony of the Gospels, in the History of the Humiliation and Sufferings of Jesus Christ from his Incarnation to his Death and Burial,' Boston, J. Foster, 1678, 4to. 19. 'A Brief Answer to a small book by John Norcot on Infant Baptism,' Boston, 1679, 8vo (Lenox copy unique). 20. 'Dying Speeches of several Indians,' Cambridge [about 1680], 18mo (Lenox copy unique; reprinted in 'Sabbath at Home,' 1868, p. 333, and partly in Dunton's 'Letters,' Prince Soc. 1867). 21. 'Shepard's Sincere Convert translated into the Indian Language,' Cambridge, 1689, sm. 8vo ('Sampwutteahae Quinnuppekompauaenin,' &c.)

[The best and most complete life is that by C. Francis (Lib. of American Biography, by J. Sparks, vol. v., Boston, 1836); the first is by Cotton Mather, 1691, afterwards incorporated in his Magnalia Christi Americana, 1702; of less importance are the different biographical sketches by R. B. Caverly (Boston, 1882), H. A. S. Dearborn (Roxbury, 1850), M. Moore (Boston, 1822), J. S. Stevens (Cheshunt, 1874). Engravings of portraits, localities, &c., and facsimiles of handwriting are to be seen in J. Winsor's History of America, vol. iii., and Memorial History of Boston, vol. i. (especially chapters on the Indians of Eastern Massachusetts and the Indian tongue and its language). See also Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography, 1887, vol. v.; F. S. Anderson's History of the Church of England in the Colonies, 1856, ii. 196, &c.; S. G. Drake's Boston, 1857; Drake's Town of Roxbury, 1878; Biglow's History of Natick, 1830; Orme's Life and Times of Baxter, 1830. 2 vols. For genealogical information see W. Winters's Memorials of the Pilgrim Fathers, 1882 (also Hist. and Gen. Register, 1874, xxviii. 140); W. H. Eliot's Genealogy of the Eliot Family, by Porter, 1854; W. H. Whitmore's Eliot Genealogy, 1856, and in New Engl. Hist. and Gen. Reg. July 1869; Savage's Genealogical Dict. A list of the tracts relating to the Indians is given by Francis (Life, pp. 345–50) and in Trumbull's Origin and Early Progress of Indian Missions in New England, 1874, from Amer. Antiq. Soc. Proc. Bibliographies of Eliot's writings are in J. Dunton's Letters from New England (Prince Soc.), Boston, 1867, pp. 204–6, and in the reprint of Eliot's Brief Narrative by Marvin, 1868, pp. 9–16. See also Thomas's History of Printing in America, 1874, 2 vols.; O'Callaghan's Editions of the Holy Scriptures, printed in America, 1861; Dexter's Congregationalism, 1880; Field's Essay towards an Indian Bibliography, 1873; Sabin's Dictionary of Books relating to America, vi. 134–42; Brinley Catalogue.] H. R. T.

ELIOT, Sir THOMAS (1490 ?–1546), diplomatist and author. [See Elyot.]

ELIOTT, Sir DANIEL (1798–1872), Indian civilian, fourth son of Sir William Eliott, sixth baronet of Stobs, Roxburghshire, was born on 3 March 1798. He was educated at the Edinburgh Academy, and, having received a nomination for the East India Company's civil service, proceeded to Madras in 1817. He soon showed a decided aptitude for the study of Indian languages and Indian law. In 1822 he was appointed deputy Ta mil translator, and in 1823 Maráthá translator to the Madras government, and deputy secretary to the board of revenue. In 1827 he became secretary to the board of revenue, and in 1836 a member of the board. In December 1838 he was nominated, on account of his profound knowledge of the laws and customs of the

Madras presidency, to be the Madras member of the Indian law commission then sitting at Calcutta under the presidency of Macaulay to draw up the Indian codes. On 15 Feb. 1848 he was appointed a member of the council at Madras, and in 1850 became president of the revenue, marine, and college boards of that government, and he returned to England in 1853 on completing his five years in that office. He did not expect to return to India, but when the East India Company decided in 1854 to form a supreme legislative council for all India, Eliott was appointed to represent Madras upon it. He accepted and remained in Calcutta as member of the legislative council until 1859, when he left India finally. When the order of the Star of India was extended in 1866, and divided into three classes, Eliott was the first Madras civilian to receive the second class, and he became a K.C.S.I. in 1867. Eliott, who married in 1818 Georgina, daughter of General George Russell of the Bengal army, and left a family of four sons and six daughters, died at The Boltons, West Brompton, on 30 Oct. 1872.

[Times, 2 Nov. 1872; East India Directories; Foster's Baronetage; Hardwicke's Knightage; Prinsep's Madras Civilians.] H. M. S.

ELIOTT, GEORGE AUGUSTUS, Lord Heathfield (1717–1790), general and defender of Gibraltar, seventh son of Sir Gilbert Eliott, third baronet, of Stobs, Roxburghshire, was born at Stobs on 25 Dec. 1717. Like most Scotchmen of his period he was educated at the university of Leyden, and he then proceeded, by special permission, to the French military college of La Fère, where he received what was supposed to be the best military education of the time. He first saw service as a volunteer with the Prussian army in the campaigns of 1735 and 1736. When he returned to England he went through a course of instruction at Woolwich, and received his commission in the English army as a field engineer. At this period there was no regular corps of sappers and miners, and engineer officers generally held commissions as well in the cavalry or infantry. Young Eliott was therefore gazetted to the 2nd horse grenadier guards, which afterwards became the 2nd life guards, as a cornet in 1739. His uncle, Colonel James Eliott, then commanded the regiment, and George Eliott was speedily promoted lieutenant and appointed adjutant. He served with this regiment throughout the war of the Austrian succession from 1742 to 1748, was present at the battle of Dettingen, where he was wounded, and at Fontenoy. He purchased his captaincy while on service, in 1745, his majority in 1749, and his lieutenant-colonelcy in 1754, when he resigned his commission as field engineer. George II, who had a great personal liking for Eliott, made him his aide-de-camp in 1755, and when it was decided to equip some regiments of light cavalry after the model of the famous Prussian hussars of Frederick the Great, he was selected to raise one, and was gazetted colonel of the 1st light horse on 10 March 1759. At the head of this regiment Eliott greatly distinguished himself in Germany throughout the campaigns of 1759, 1760, and 1761, and was repeatedly thanked by Prince Ferdinand for his services. He was a military enthusiast, and made his regiment a pattern to the army, and he was particularly noted for the care which he took to make his troopers comfortable in their quarters, though he himself was a perfect Spartan in the field, living on vegetarian diet, and drinking nothing but water. He commanded the cavalry as brigadier-general in the descent upon the French coast in 1761, and was promoted major-general in the following year and sent as second in command to the Earl of Albemarle in the expedition to Cuba. During the fierce fighting and the terrible ravages of disease which decimated the English army in that island, he made himself conspicuous by his valour and constancy, and, when he returned to England in 1763, after the capture of Havana, he was promoted lieutenant-general. As second in command he received a large share of the prize money of Havana, and with it purchased the estate of Heathfield in Sussex, from which he afterwards took his title. On the conclusion of the seven years' war George III reviewed Eliott's regiment of light horse in Hyde Park, and after expressing his astonishment at its admirable condition and efficiency, asked its colonel what honour he could confer upon it, when the general in courtly fashion begged that it might be called the royal regiment. The regiment was accordingly renamed the 15th, or king's own royal light dragoons, a designation now borne by its successor, the 15th hussars. Eliott was at the close of 1774 appointed commander-in-chief of the forces in Ireland, a post which he held only until 1775, when, there being every prospect that Spain as well as France would, under the arrangement of the *pacte de famille*, take advantage of the rebellion in America to attack England, an experienced governor was needed for the fortress of Gibraltar, and Eliott was selected for the post. The Spaniards had never been reconciled to the possession by the English of Gibraltar; to recover it had been one of the favourite schemes of every prominent Spanish statesman from Alberoni to Wall, and Eliott was

specially instructed to put the fortress into a condition of defence and to be prepared for an attack. He had some time in which to put the defences into good repair, for it was not until 1779 that the Spaniards turned their land blockade of the fortress into a regular siege by sea and land. Drinkwater's history of this famous siege, which lasted for three years, has become an English classic, and in it will be found abundant proofs of the energy and ability of Eliott. All the efforts of the greatest engineers of the time, even D'Arzon's invention of firing red-hot shot, failed to make an impression on the defences, and the assaults on the land side were easily repulsed. Far more formidable to the garrison than the bombardment was the close blockade by sea and land, and in the second year of the siege Eliott's little force was reduced to the utmost extremity of famine. He could not have held out much longer, in spite of all his firmness, had not Rear-admiral Lord Howe by breaking the blockade brought a convoy to the beleaguered garrison after one of the most brilliant naval actions of the war. On the conclusion of peace and the cessation of the siege Eliott returned to England, where he received the rewards which he deserved. He was made a knight of the Bath, and on 14 June 1787 was raised to the peerage as Lord Heathfield, baron of Gibraltar. He died at Aix-la-Chapelle of palsy, two days before he had intended to start for Gibraltar, on 6 July 1790, and was buried in Heathfield Church. He married, on 8 June 1748, Anne Pollexfen, daughter and heiress of Sir Francis Henry Drake, last baronet, of Buckland Abbey, Devonshire. By her he left a daughter Anne and a son, Francis Augustus Eliott, second lord Heathfield, who was colonel successively of the 25th light dragoons, the 20th light dragoons, and the 1st or king's dragoon guards, and rose to the rank of general. On the death of the second Lord Heathfield on 26 Jan. 1813 the peerage became extinct. The first lord's daughter, Anne, married John Trayton Fuller of Ashdown Park, Sussex, whose third son, Thomas, assumed the surnames of Eliott-Drake in 1813 on succeeding to the estates of the Eliotts and Drakes on the second lord's death, and was created a baronet in 1821. The features of the defender of Gibraltar are well known from the magnificent portrait of him by Sir Joshua Reynolds now in the National Gallery.

[Army Lists; Chambers's Eminent Scotsmen; Vizetelly's Georgian Biography; Foster's Baronetage; and especially Drinkwater's Two Sieges of Gibraltar.] H. M. S.

ELIZABETH, queen of Edward IV (1437?–1492), was the daughter of Sir Richard Woodville or Wydeville, afterwards Earl Rivers, by his marriage with Jaquetta, duchess of Bedford, widow of that duke of Bedford who was regent of France during Henry VI's minority. Almost all the Woodville family seem to have combined ambition with a love of chivalry, and the first considerable step in their rise was this marriage of Sir Richard with a dowager duchess who was daughter of Peter de Luxembourg, late count of St. Pol. It took place, or at least was discovered, very early in 1437, having been effected without license from the king of England, and greatly to the disgust of the bride's brother, Louis, then count of St. Pol, and of her uncle, the bishop of Terouenne (Stow, *Annals*, p. 376, ed. 1615). The consequence was that Sir Richard had to pay the king 1,000*l.* for his transgression and for liberty to enjoy the lands of his wife's dowry; but he did valuable service in the French wars, in reward for which he was created Baron Rivers by Henry VI in 1448, long before Edward IV was attracted by the charms of his daughter.

Sir Richard was regarded as the handsomest man in England. His bride, too, was remarkable for her beauty. They had a family of seven sons and six daughters, of whom Elizabeth was the eldest, born probably in 1437, within a year after her parents' marriage (the date 1431 hitherto given is absurd, being four years before the Duke of Bedford's death). Nothing is known of her early life except that we find two letters addressed to her before her first marriage, the one by Richard, duke of York, and the other by the great Earl of Warwick, both in favour of a certain Sir Hugh John, who wished to be her husband (*Archæologia*, xxix. 132). She, however, actually married Sir John Grey, son and heir of Edward Grey, lord Ferrers of Groby, who should have succeeded to his father's title in 1457, but is spoken of by all historians simply as Sir John Grey. After this marriage it appears that she became one of the four ladies of the bedchamber to Margaret of Anjou, in whose wardrobe-book she is mentioned as 'Lady Isabella Grey' (the name Isabella was in those days a mere variation of Elizabeth). Her husband was killed at the second battle of St. Albans in 1461, fighting on the Lancastrian side. She was thus left a widow with two sons, Sir Thomas and Sir Richard Grey, in the very year that Edward IV became king, and the lands which she should have had as her dower appear to have been forfeited or withheld. In her poverty she made personal suit to the king

for their restoration upon his visiting her mother at Grafton [see EDWARD IV].

Edward's first thoughts were to take a dishonourable advantage of his suppliant, but she withstood all offers to be his paramour and so increased his passion by her refusal that, without asking the advice of his councillors, who he knew would oppose his wishes, he made up his mind to marry her. The wedding took place at Grafton early in the morning of 1 May 1464, none being present but the parties themselves, the Duchess of Bedford, the priest, two gentlemen, 'and a young man to help the priest sing.' The fact was very carefully kept secret, and the king, after spending three or four hours with his bride, left her for Stony Stratford, where it was supposed that he had returned to rest after a day's hunting. A day or two later, it is said, he sent a message to Lord Rivers that he would come and pay him a visit, and he was received again at Grafton, where he stayed four days, this time as an avowed guest, though not as an avowed son-in-law, the bride being so secretly brought to his bed that hardly any one knew it except her mother.

The marriage was made known at Michaelmas, with results which principally belong to political history [see EDWARD IV]. The queen's influence was also apparent in the advancement of her own relations. Her sister Margaret was married in October to Thomas, lord Maltravers, who many years after succeeded his father as Earl of Arundel. Another sister, Mary, was married two years later to William, son and heir of Lord Herbert, who after succeeding his father as Earl of Pembroke, exchanged that title for the earldom of Huntingdon. Other sisters also were well provided for in marriage, and Lord Rivers, the queen's father, from being a simple baron was promoted to an earldom. All this excited much envy. But a very justifiable indignation was felt at the marriage procured for her brother John, for the young man, who was only twenty years old, consented to become the fourth husband of Catherine, duchess of Norfolk, a woman of nearly fourscore. That such a match should have led to much unhappiness is only what we might expect, but the words in which this seems to be intimated by William Worcester are enigmatical to modern readers. 'Vindicta Bernardi,' he says, 'inter eosdem postea patuit.'

The queen's relations were exceedingly unpopular, not only with the old nobility, whom they supplanted, but with the common people. This was shown by the manifestos published by the insurgents in Robin of Redesdale's insurrection, and even in the very end of Edward's reign strong indications of the same fact appear in contemporary records (GAIRDNER, *Life of Richard III*, App. pp. 393–4). The queen herself does not appear to have possessed those conciliatory qualities which would have diminished the prejudice entertained against her as an upstart, and it is clear that she and her relations were a great cause of the dissensions which prevailed in Edward's family.

She was crowned at Westminster on Whitsunday, 26 May 1465. The first three children of the marriage were all girls—Elizabeth, Mary, and Cecily. One of the king's physicians named Master Dominick had assured him the queen was about to give him a son on her first confinement; and at her delivery he stood in the second chamber anxious to get the first news. As soon as he heard the child cry he inquired secretly at the chamber door 'what the queen had,' on which he was answered by one of the ladies, 'Whatsoever the queen's grace hath here within, sure it is that a fool standeth there without.'

Except a visit to Norwich with the king in 1469 (*Paston Letters*, ii. 354–5), there is little to record in the domestic life of Elizabeth till the time that her husband was driven abroad in 1470. Just before receiving the news of his flight she had victualled and fortified the Tower against any enemies who might attack it, but hearing that he had fled the kingdom to avoid being made prisoner by the Nevills, she hastily withdrew into the sanctuary at Westminster, where she gave birth to her eldest son [see EDWARD V]. There she remained half a year while Henry VI was restored and her husband attainted, but in April following her husband, having returned, came and delivered her from her confinement and lodged her at Baynard's Castle, where they rested together one night before he quitted London again to fight Warwick at Barnet. Some time after these events she was praised by the speaker of the House of Commons for her 'womanly behaviour and great constancy' while her husband was beyond the sea (*Archæologia*, xxvi. 280).

In September 1471 she went on pilgrimage with the king to Canterbury (*Paston Letters*, iii. 17). In 1472 she appears to have accompanied him on a visit to Oxford, where her brother, Lionel Woodville, who had just been elected chancellor of the university, received them with an oration. Early in 1473 she was in Wales with the prince, her eldest son by the king (*ib.* iii. 83). But the chief events in her life after her husband's restoration were the births of her children. In 1471 she had a daughter, who died young, and was buried at Westminster. Richard,

her second son by King Edward, was born at Shrewsbury on 17 Aug. 1472. A third son, George, who died young, was also born at Shrewsbury, according to an old genealogy, in March 1473 (doubtless 1474 of our reckoning, considering the date of the previous birth). The remaining children were a daughter, Anne, born at Westminster on 2 Nov. 1475, and two other daughters, named, the one Catherine, born before August 1479, and the other Bridget, the youngest of the family, born at Eltham on 10 Nov. 1480 (compare NICOLAS, prefatory remarks to *Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York*; and the *Gent. Mag.* for 1831, vol. ci. pt. i. p. 24).

In 1475, when Edward IV made his will at Sandwich before crossing the sea to invade France, he appointed his wife to be principal executrix, but made no special provision for her beyond her dower, except securing to her some household goods as private property and ordaining that the marriage portions which he bequeathed to his daughters should be conditional on her approval of the marriages contracted by them (*Excerpta Historica*, 369, 378). Soon after this we find evidence of the ill-will borne to her by Clarence, who, when his duchess died in the end of 1476, attributed her death to poison administered by her attendants and sorcery practised by the queen. The interests of the duke and of the queen seem to have been much opposed to each other. The former, after the death of Charles the Bold, duke of Burgundy, in 1477, sought by the medium of his sister, the widowed duchess, to obtain his daughter and heiress, Mary, in marriage. To this Edward was strongly opposed, as the possession of so rich a duchy could not but have made him dangerously powerful. Yet the queen's brother, Anthony, earl Rivers, aspired to the same lady's hand, and Elizabeth, perhaps after Clarence's death, wrote to the Duchess Margaret asking her to favour his suit, which, however, was rejected with disdain by the council of Flanders as totally unsuitable in point of rank.

In 1478, just before the death of Clarence, took place the marriage of the child, Richard, duke of York, the king's second son, then only in his sixth year, with Anne Mowbray, a mere babe in her third year, daughter and heiress of the last Duke of Norfolk, who had died without male issue the year before. It is difficult to say positively that this match was more due to the queen's influence than to Edward's own policy; but it seems to have much in common with the selfish alliances, some of them quite unnatural, procured by the queen for her own relations.

On the death of Edward IV in 1483 strong evidence soon appeared of the jealousy with which Elizabeth and her relations were regarded. Although Edward had on his deathbed conjured the lords about him to forget their dissensions, suspicion at once revived when the queen proposed in council that her son, young Edward V, should come up from Wales with a strong escort. Hastings threatened to retire to Calais, where he was governor, if the escort was greater than was necessary for the prince's safety, and the queen was obliged to promise that it should not exceed two thousand horse. Her son, the Marquis of Dorset, however, being constable of the Tower, equipped some vessels as if for war. The whole Woodville party clearly expected that they would have a struggle to maintain themselves, and when Gloucester and Buckingham, overtaking the young king on his way up to London, arrested his uncle, Rivers, his half-brother, Lord Richard Grey, and their attendants, Vaughan and Hawte, the act seems to have met with the cordial approval, not only of Hastings, but even of the citizens of London.

Elizabeth threw herself into the sanctuary at Westminster, taking with her her second son and her five surviving daughters, and conveying thither in great haste a mass of personal property and furniture, to make easy entrance for which her servants actually broke down the walls which separated the palace from the sanctuary. While this removal was going on, Archbishop Rotherham came to her and endeavoured to allay her fears, assuring her that if they set aside young Edward he would crown his brother, the Duke of York, whom she had with her in the sanctuary. As some sort of security for this, he very improperly placed the great seal for a while in her hands, but he soon repented his indiscretion and sent for it again.

Elizabeth remained in sanctuary during the whole of the brief nominal reign of her son, Edward V. She certainly had little reason to trust the protector Gloucester, who on 13 June, in that celebrated scene in the council chamber in the Tower, very absurdly accused her of conspiring against him with Jane Shore, and practising witchcraft by which his arm was withered. Yet, notwithstanding the violent issue of that day's proceedings in the execution of Hastings, she let herself be persuaded by Cardinal Bourchier the very Monday after to deliver up her only remaining son out of sanctuary to keep company with his brother in the Tower. Then followed, almost immediately, the usurpation of Richard III, and, a little later, the murder of both the young princes whom the usurper had in his power.

That Richard lost, even by his usurpation, a certain amount of popularity which he had enjoyed as protector, is distinctly stated by Fabyan, and from the words of another contemporary writer it is clear that apprehensions were immediately entertained for the safety of the princes. Plans were formed for getting some of their sisters out of sanctuary and conveying them secretly abroad, even before the murder was known or the rebellion of Buckingham had broken out. But Richard surrounded the sanctuary with a guard, and the total failure of Buckingham's rebellion in October extinguished for a time all hope of getting rid of the tyrant. His title, which was founded on the alleged invalidity of Edward IV's marriage, was confirmed by parliament in January 1484, and the queen dowager was officially recognised only as 'dame Elizabeth Grey.' Nevertheless Richard, on 1 March, thought it right to make her a very solemn promise, witnessed by the peers of the realm and the mayor and aldermen of London, that if she and her daughters would come out of sanctuary and submit to him he would make handsome provision for their living and find the young ladies husbands. His object clearly was to make her abandon hope of aid from abroad, for she had already consented to the project for marrying her eldest daughter to the Earl of Richmond, and it was in concert with her that a plan had been laid, which the stormy weather frustrated, for Richmond to invade England in aid of Buckingham. She now apparently had lost hope of Richmond's success, for she not only accepted the usurper's offer and came out of sanctuary with her daughters, but even wrote to her son, the Marquis of Dorset, at Paris, advising him also to desert the Earl of Richmond's cause.

The Earl of Richmond could not but feel this somewhat when, after Bosworth Field, he became king of England; but as he was clearly pledged to marry her daughter, he overlooked for a while what Elizabeth had done in the days of tyranny, and put her, for the first time, in full possession of her rights as queen dowager (*Rolls of Parl.* vi. 288). On 4 March 1486 she received a grant of the main portion of her dower lands which belonged to the duchy of Lancaster, and next day a separate grant for the remainder, under the great seal of England. But within a year what was then granted was again withdrawn from her, for in February 1487, on the breaking out of Simnel's rebellion, Henry VII held a council at Sheen, where it was determined, among other things, that she had forfeited her right to all her property by breaking promise to Henry in his exile and delivering her daughters into Richard's hands. She was, therefore, induced to withdraw into the abbey of Bermondsey, where, as King Edward's widow, she was entitled to apartments formerly reserved for the Earls of Gloucester, and to content herself with a pension of four hundred marks allowed her by the king, which was increased in February 1490 to 400*l.* The lands of her dower were given to her daughter, the queen consort (Campbell, *Materials for a History of Henry VII*, ii. 142, 148, 225, 319; *Patent*, 19 Feb. 5 Hen. VII, m. 16), and she herself sank into a retirement, from which she only emerged on special occasions, leading, as we are informed by a contemporary, 'a wretched and miserable life' (Hall, 431). A project, however, was entertained, not long after her disgrace in 1487, for marrying her to James III of Scotland, who had just become a widower (Rymer, xii. 328); and at the close of 1489 she was with her daughter, the queen, when, soon after the birth of the Princess Margaret, she received in her chamber an embassy from France, headed by their kinsman, Francis, sieur de Luxembourg (Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 249).

In 1492 her last illness overtook her at Bermondsey, and on 10 April she dictated her will, in which she desired to be buried at Windsor beside her husband, and having, as she expressly says, no worldly goods to bequeath to the queen, her daughter, or her other children, she left them merely her blessing. She died on 8 June, the Friday before Whitsunday, and as it was her own request to have speedy burial with little pomp, her body was conveyed by water to Windsor on the Sunday, without any ringing of bells. There, on the Tuesday following, it was laid beside the body of King Edward in St. George's Chapel, in the presence of all her daughters except the queen, who was then about to be confined.

Such in brief is the story of Elizabeth Woodville, to which some highly romantic details have been added, on no apparent authority, by a learned but fantastic writer of the last century (Prévost) in a biography of Margaret of Anjou. Her marriage with Edward was a romance in itself, but we may safely dismiss the story of her fascinating the Earl of Warwick, and being used by Margaret as a lure to entrap him.

There is preserved in the Record Office a letter signed by Elizabeth when she was queen consort and addressed to Sir William Stonor, warning him against interfering with the game in her forests, even under colour of a commission from the king, her husband.

It certainly conveys the impression that she was a woman who did not easily forego her rights. That which is most to her honour of her recorded acts is the refounding and endowment by her of Queens' College, Cambridge, which her rival, Margaret of Anjou, had founded before her. There is a portrait of her in the hall of this college, which is engraved in Miss Strickland's 'Queens of England.'

[Dugdale's Baronage; Fabyan's Chronicle; Paston Letters; History of the Arrival of Edward IV (Camden Soc.); Warkworth's Chronicle (Camd. Soc.); Polydore Vergil; Hall's Chronicle (ed. 1809); Will. Wyrcester, in Stevenson's Wars of the English in France (Rolls Ser.); Collections of a London Citizen and Three Fifteenth-century Chronicles (Camden Soc.); Archæologia Cantiana, i. 147–9; Campbell's Materials for a History of Henry VII (Rolls Ser.); Arundel MS. 26, f. 29 *b* (Brit. Mus.); Royal Wills, 350; Miss Strickland's Lives of the Queens of England, vol. ii.] J. G.

ELIZABETH, queen of Henry VII (1465–1503), of York, the eldest child of Edward IV and Elizabeth Woodville, his queen, was born at Westminster Palace on 11 Feb. 1465. She was baptised in the abbey with much pomp, and had for sponsors her grandmother, the Duchess of York, the Duchess of Bedford, and Warwick, the kingmaker. In 1467 the manor of Great Lynford; in Buckinghamshire was granted to her for life, and shortly afterwards 400*l.* a year was assigned to the queen for the expenses of the princesses Elizabeth and Mary. In 1469 Edward arranged that she should marry George Nevill, whom he created Duke of Bedford; but as the bridegroom's father, the Marquis of Montague, turned, like the other Nevills, against the king, the match was set aside, and in 1477 the Duke of Bedford was degraded. In 1475, when Edward was on the point of invading France, he made his will, in which he assigned to his two daughters, Elizabeth and Mary, ten thousand marks each for their marriages, on condition that they allowed themselves to be guided in making them by their mother the queen and by the prince when he came to years of discretion. But only two months later Edward made peace with France, with an express condition that Elizabeth should be married to the dauphin as soon as the parties were of suitable age. In 1478 her dowry was settled, and it was agreed that on her marriage the expenses of conveying her to France should be paid by Louis XI. In 1480, she being then in her sixteenth year, Edward sent Lord Howard and Dr. Langton to France to make further arrangements; but Louis had other objects in view and had no intention of completing the marriage.

Another match is said to have been proposed for Elizabeth at one time, and even urged rather strongly by her father, that is with Henry, earl of Richmond. But the truth appears to be that the earl being then a refugee in Brittany, Edward was very anxious to get him into his hands, and nearly succeeded in persuading the Duke of Brittany to deliver him up, pretending that he had no wish to keep him in prison, but rather to marry him to his own daughter. The suggestion certainly was not made in good faith, for Edward had already engaged his daughter to the dauphin; but the match suggested was probably thought of by some even at this early period as a desirable mode of uniting the claims of Lancaster and York. After the death of Edward IV in April 1483, his widow, with her five daughters and her second son, Richard, threw herself into the sanctuary of Westminster, in fear of her brother-in-law, Richard, duke of Gloucester, who, however, being declared protector, actually induced her to give up her second son to keep company with his brother Edward V. Soon after the two princes disappeared, and there is no reason to doubt were murdered.

In October occurred the Duke of Buckingham's rebellion against Richard III, which was planned in concert with the Countess of Richmond, and which if successful would have made the earl, her son, king two years before he actually came to the throne. It was agreed among the confederates that the earl should marry Elizabeth, who was now, by the death of both her brothers, heiress of Edward IV. Even before the murder took place a project seems to have been entertained of getting her or some of her sisters out of sanctuary in disguise and carried beyond sea for security. But Richard surrounded the monastery with a guard under one John Nesfield, so that no one could enter or leave the sanctuary without permission, and Queen Elizabeth and her daughters remained in confinement for fully ten months without much hope of more comfortable quarters. Meanwhile Richard had called a parliament which confirmed his title to the crown by declaring the whole issue of his brother Edward IV to be bastards. But on 1 March 1484 he gave the ladies a written promise that if they would come out of sanctuary and be guided by him they should not only be sure of their lives and persons, but he would make suitable provision for their living and marry the daughters to 'gentlemen born,' giving each of them landed property to the yearly value of two hundred marks. The lords

spiritual and temporal and the lord mayor and aldermen of London were called to witness this engagement, which was evidently intended to destroy the hopes which the Earl of Richmond built upon his future marriage with Elizabeth of York, and it was so far successful that not only did the ladies leave sanctuary, but the queen dowager abandoned Richmond's cause, while her daughter Elizabeth was treated with so much attention at court that strange rumours arose in consequence. It was noticed particularly that at Christmas following dresses of the same shape and colour were delivered to the queen and to her, from which it was surmised by some that Richard intended getting rid of his queen either by divorce or death, and then marrying his niece. When the queen actually died on 16 March following (1485), a report at once got abroad that this marriage was seriously contemplated. If indeed we are to believe Sir George Buck, a seventeenth-century antiquary who professes to write from documentary evidence, Elizabeth herself had cherished the hope of it for months, and was impatient for the day the queen would die. No one else, however, appears to have seen the document which conveys so serious an imputation, and we cannot think it justified by anything we really know of Elizabeth's conduct or character. The report nevertheless created so much indignation that Richard's own leading councillors induced him publicly to disavow any such intentions before the mayor and citizens of London. Anxious, however, to discourage the Earl of Richmond's hopes, he sent Elizabeth to Sheriff Hutton Castle in Yorkshire, where she remained till the battle of Bosworth was fought in August following.

The account given of Elizabeth's conduct at this time in the 'Song of the Lady Bessy' is no less open to suspicion in some matters than that of the antiquary above mentioned; but it certainly is not altogether fabulous. It exhibits Elizabeth as a paragon of excellence, declares that she utterly loathed the proposal of King Richard to put away his queen and marry her, and sets forth in detail how she induced Lord Stanley to intrigue against the usurper, and how she was, in fact, the chief organiser of the confederacy with the Earl of Richmond. But the poem is important chiefly as having certainly been (at least in its original form, for it has no doubt been a good deal altered in parts) the composition of a contemporary, one Humphrey Brereton, a servant of Lord Stanley, afterwards Earl of Derby; and it is our sole authority for several facts of interest about Elizabeth, recapitulated by Nicolas, as follows, viz.: That she 'was especially commended to the care of Lord Stanley by Edward IV on his deathbed; that she lodged in his house in London after she quitted the sanctuary; that she was privy to the rising in favour of Richmond; that she could write and read both French and Spanish; that Brereton was sent into Cheshire to Stanley's son, Lord Strange, to his brother, and to other relations, entreating them to support Richmond's cause; and that he was the bearer of letters to Henry in Brittany, together with a letter and a ring from Elizabeth to him.' We may add that in one place Elizabeth's golden hair is incidentally referred to, and we have got perhaps the most trustworthy facts in a few words.

After Henry VII had won the battle of Bosworth he sent for Elizabeth. But although it was certainly expected that he would have married her at once, and that she would have been crowned as queen on 30 Oct., the day of his coronation, he deferred marrying her for five months; and some time before he made her his queen it appears that he declared her Duchess of York (*Ven. Cal.* i. No. 506). His own title to the crown, derived through his mother from a bastard son of John of Gaunt legitimated by act of parliament, was not altogether satisfactory; but for that very reason, apparently, he wished parliament to recognise it as sufficient. So the houses met in November, and enacted, without stating any reasons, that the inheritance should 'be, rest and abide' in his person and the heirs of his body; and afterwards, on 11 Dec., the speaker petitioned him that he would be pleased to marry the lady Elizabeth, 'from which by the grace of God many hoped there would arise offspring of the race of kings for the comfort of the whole realm' (*Rolls of Parl.* vi. 270, 278). Thus invited, he actually married her on 18 Jan. following at Westminster, though it would almost seem that he had intended waiting longer still; for as he and Elizabeth were within the prohibited degrees, he applied to Pope Innocent VIII for a dispensation as soon as his title was ratified in parliament; but instead of waiting till he received the document, he took advantage of the presence in England of the Bishop of Imola, a papal legate empowered to grant a limited number of such dispensations, and was actually married six weeks before the expected brief was even issued, for it was dated 2 March. This brief, however, was confirmed by a bull dated 27 March, issued by the pope *motu proprio* without solicitation, excommunicating all who should rebel against Henry. On 23 July another bull was issued to confirm what

was done under the Bishop of Imola's dispensation (Rymer, xii. 294, 297, 313).

It may be judged from the first of these papal instruments—which speaks of Henry's title having been acknowledged in parliament *nemine contradicente*—how anxious Henry was to have the point clearly recognised in the first place, and that it should by no means appear that he owed his seat to his wife. This consideration perhaps influenced him to some extent when he determined to leave her behind him in a progress which he made northwards as far as York in the spring of 1486, and it is supposed to have been at least one cause of his delaying her coronation as queen till November of the following year. It is clear, however, that there were other causes besides this, some of indisputable weight; and there are reasons for doubting somewhat the character commonly ascribed to Henry of a cold and unloving husband.

Elizabeth was brought to bed of her first child, Arthur [q. v.], in September 1486 at Winchester. She founded a chapel in Winchester Cathedral in honour of her safe delivery, but her recovery was retarded for some time by an ague. In a few weeks she was well enough to remove to Greenwich, where she and the king kept a considerable court at the feast of Allhallows (1 Nov.) In March 1487 the king again left her and made a progress without her through Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, and thence to Coventry, where he arrived on St. George's eve (22 April), and kept the feast next day. Here the Archbishop of Canterbury and a number of the bishops were assembled, and *in pontificalibus* declared the pope's bull in confirmation of his right to the crown, cursing, moreover, with book, bell, and candle, all those who opposed it. Presently news came that the Earl of Lincoln had landed in Ireland, and that a rebel host might be expected immediately in England. Henry sent for his queen to come to him at Kenilworth, where tidings reached him of the landing of the enemy in Lancashire. The rebels were defeated at the battle of Stoke on 16 June, and the kingdom being now in a more settled state Henry in September despatched letters from Warwick summoning the nobility to attend the coronation of the queen on 25 Nov. following. He and Elizabeth left Warwick for London on 27 Oct., and celebrated the feast of All Saints at St. Albans. Next day (2 Nov.) he reached Barnet, and on the following morning he was met at Haringay Park by the mayor, sheriffs, and aldermen of London on horseback, with some picked men of every company, who conducted them with due honour into the city to St. Paul's, where a 'Te Deum' was sung for his victory. The queen, who must have been sent on before, viewed the procession from a house in St. Mary's Spital without Bishopsgate, where she and the king's mother and some other great persons took up a position unobserved; and after the procession had passed, they went to Greenwich to rest that night.

In preparation for her coronation the queen left Greenwich by water on Friday, 23 Nov., accompanied by the king's mother, and attended by the city authorities in barges richly decorated, of which one in particular, named the 'Bachelor's Barge,' attracted attention by a red dragon spouting fire into the Thames. She landed at the Tower, and was there received by the king, who then created eleven knights of the Bath in honour of the approaching ceremony. Next day after dinner she departed in great state from her chamber, 'her fair yellow hair hanging down plain behind her back,' and her sister Cecily bearing her train; and entering her litter was conveyed in it through the city to Westminster, meeting, of course, with numerous pageants on the way. For a detailed account of these things, and of the coronation itself and the banquet following, the reader is referred to Leland's 'Collectanea,' iv. 217–33.

On 26 Dec. following she received from the king a grant of the lordships and manors of Waltham Magna, Badewe, Mashbury, Dunmow, Lighe, and Farnham in the county of Essex belonging to the duchy of Lancaster, with the offices of feodary and bailiff in the same. This grant, which was to take effect from 20 Feb. preceding, is not a little noteworthy, because the very same manors and offices had been already granted, on 4 March 1486, to her mother, the widowed queen of Edward IV, but had been taken from her in February 1487 on the outbreak of Lambert Simnel's rebellion (Campbell, *Materials for a History of Henry VII*, i. 121, ii. 221). Warrants had also been issued in the spring to the officers of the exchequer to pay over to the use of the queen consort all the issues of the lands lately belonging to the queen dowager (*ib.* ii. 142, 148). The fact that the latter had fallen out of favour does not seem to have dimmed the court festivities that year at Greenwich, and both the king and queen went crowned at the Twelfth-day solemnities (Leland, *Collectanea*, iv. 234–6).

On the Sunday after St. George's day, 1488, she rode in procession at Windsor with her mother-in-law, the Countess of Richmond, in a rich car covered with cloth of gold drawn by six horses, her sister Anne following, dressed in robes of the order, and twenty-one ladies in crimson velvet mounted on white palfreys. In

1489 the queen took her chamber with much ceremony at Westminster on Allhallows eve, and was delivered, 29 Nov., of a daughter, Margaret, destined to be ancestress of the royal line of Great Britain. During her confinement Elizabeth received in her chamber a great embassy from France, headed by Francis, sieur de Luxembourg, a kinsman of her own (*ib.* 239, 249). The next family event was the birth of her second son Henry, afterwards Henry VIII, at Greenwich on 28 June 1491. Next year she had a daughter, Elizabeth, named probably after her mother, Elizabeth Woodville, who died about that time. This child only lived three years, and was buried in Westminster Abbey in September 1495. Then followed Mary, born, according to Sandford, in 1498, but more probably in 1496, who became the queen of the aged Louis XII of France; Edmund, born in 1499, who died next year; and Catherine, born in 1503, who also died an infant. An interesting account is given by Erasmus of the children of the family as they were in 1500, when he visited the royal nursery (*Catalogus Erasmi Lucubrationum*, 1523, Basle, f. *a b*).

In 1492 Henry VII invaded France, and formed the siege of Boulogne, but receiving satisfactory offers from the French king soon made peace and returned to England. Henry's poet laureate and historiographer, Bernard Andreas [q. v.], insinuates that the frequent and anxiously affectionate letters addressed to him by his queen had some influence in promoting his early return. And though even Andreas admits that there were more potent reasons, we may presume that the letters were a fact. In the summer of 1495 Elizabeth went with the king into Lancashire, when they visited, at Lathom, the Earl of Derby, whose brother, Sir William Stanley, had not long before been put to death for treason.

In June 1497 we meet with an interesting entry in the privy purse expenses of Henry VII: 'To the queen's grace for garnishing of a salett, 10*l.*,' indicating, apparently, that either with a view to a proposed expedition against Scotland, or when he went to meet the rebels at Blackheath, Elizabeth ornamented his helmet with jewels with her own hands. In October following, when the king had gone westward to meet Perkin Warbeck, the Venetian ambassador reported that he had put his queen and his eldest son in a very strong castle on the coast, with vessels to convey them away if necessary (*Ven. Cal.* vol. i. No. 756). When Perkin and his wife were captured, Henry sent the latter to Elizabeth, who took her into her service. In 1500 the queen went with Henry to Calais, where they stayed during the greater part of May and June. The long-projected marriage of their son Arthur took place in November 1501; but to the bitter grief of both parents he died on 2 April following. A touching account is preserved of the manner in which they received the news (Leland, *Collectanea*, v. 373–4), and the story, written by a contemporary pen, seems to show that Henry was not altogether such a cold, unsympathetic husband as is commonly supposed.

That the blow told upon Elizabeth's health seems probable from several indications. A payment to her apothecary 'for certain stuff of his occupation' occurs in her privy purse expenses on 9 April 1502, and in the following summer she was ill at Woodstock (*Privy Purse Expenses*, 8, 37). Moreover, it was the last year of her life. But it may be that she was in delicate health before Arthur's death; for in March of the same year, when the only known book of her accounts begins, she appears to have despatched various messengers to perform pilgrimages on her account and make offerings at all the most favoured shrines throughout the country. In January 1503 she was confined once more, this time in the Tower of London, and on 2 Feb. gave birth to her last child, Catherine. Soon after she became dangerously ill, and a special physician was sent for from Gravesend (*ib.* 96). But all was of no avail. She died on her birthday, 11 Feb., at the age of thirty-eight.

There seems always to have been but one opinion as to the gentleness and goodness of Elizabeth. Sir Thomas More wrote an elegy for her. A Spanish envoy reported that she was 'a very noble woman, and much beloved,' adding the further remark that she was kept in subjection by her mother-in-law, the Countess of Richmond. Neither is there any doubt about her beauty, to which testimony still is borne by her effigy in Westminster Abbey, as well as by various portraits. She was rather tall for her sex, and had her mother's fair complexion and long golden hair.

[Fabyan's Chronicle; Hall's Chronicle; Hist. Croylandensis Continuatio, in Fulman's Scriptores; Wilhelmi Wyrcester Annales; Rutland Papers (Camden Soc.); Venetian Calendar, vol. i.; Spanish Calendar, vol. i.; Nicolas's Privy Purse Expenses of Elizabeth of York; Campbell's Materials for a History of Henry VII (Rolls Ser.); Miss Strickland's Queens of England, vol. ii.]

J. G.

ELIZABETH (1533–1603), queen of England and Ireland, was born at Greenwich on 7 Sept. 1533. She was the daughter of

Henry VIII, by Anne Boleyn [q. v.], whose secret marriage had been celebrated in the previous January. Three days after her birth (10 Sept.) she was baptised at the church of the Grey Friars at Greenwich by Stokesley, bishop of London, Cranmer, who had been consecrated archbishop of Canterbury that same year, standing as her godfather. The ritual was that of the Roman church, and the ceremonial was conducted with great pomp and magnificence. Margaret, lady Bryan, mother of the dissolute but gifted Sir Francis Bryan [q. v.], was appointed governess to the young princess, as she had previously been to her sister, the Princess Mary. Lady Bryan proved herself to be a careful and affectionate guardian, who, under circumstances of extraordinary difficulty, consistently kept in view the interests of her ward. During the first two or three years of her infancy the princess was moved about from house to house. Sometimes she was at Greenwich, sometimes at Hatfield, sometimes at the Bishop of Winchester's palace at Chelsea. On Friday, 7 Jan. 1536, Queen Catherine died at Kimbolton. On Friday, 19 May, Queen Anne Boleyn was beheaded. Next day the king married Jane Seymour. On 1 July the parliament declared that the Lady Mary, daughter of the first queen, and the Princess Elizabeth, daughter of the second, were equally illegitimate, and that 'the succession to the throne be now therefore determined to the issue of the marriage with Queen Jane.' Less than six months before (Sunday, 9 Jan.), Henry, in the glee of his heart at Queen Catherine's death, 'clad all over in yellow, from top to toe, except the white feather he had in his bonnet,' had sent for the little princess, who was 'conducted to mass with trumpets and other great triumphs,' and after dinner, 'carrying her in his arms, he showed her first to one and then to another.'

On 12 Oct. 1537 Queen Jane was delivered of a son, and on the 24th she died. There was a male heir to the throne at last. At his christening Elizabeth, then four years old, carried the chrysom, or baptismal robe, and in the procession that followed she passed out of the chapel hand in hand with her sister Mary, eighteen years her senior. Parliament might declare the two illegitimate, but it was for the king to say whether or not he would accept the sentence and give it his fiat. In the years that followed, Elizabeth and the young prince passed much of their childhood together; their education was very carefully looked to, and all authorities agree in saying that Elizabeth exhibited remarkable precocity, acquired without difficulty some knowledge of Latin, French, and Italian, and showed respectable proficiency in music. When Anne of Cleves came over to be married to the king in January 1540, that much injured lady was charmed with the grace and accomplishments of the little princess, and one of the earliest of her letters which has been preserved is addressed to Anne very shortly after the marriage; another eight years later, in the Record Office, shows that kindly and familiar intercourse was kept up between the two, probably till the death of the queen dowager in 1548. The marriage with Anne of Cleves [q. v.] was dissolved on 9 July 1540. Henry married Catherine Howard on the 28th, and beheaded her on 13 Feb. 1543. On 12 July of that same year he married his last wife, Catherine Parr. The new queen was exactly the person best qualified to exercise a beneficial influence upon the princess, now in her tenth year, and there is reason to believe that the daughter learned to love and respect the stepmother, who, it is said, not only proved herself a staunch friend to the royal maiden, but, herself a woman of quite exceptional culture and literary taste, took a deep and intelligent interest in the education of Elizabeth and her brother. During this and the next few years we find her with her sister giving audience to the imperial ambassadors during this summer of 1543, and present at her father's last marriage in July, sometimes residing with the Princess Mary at Haveringatte-Bower, sometimes occupying apartments at Whitehall, sometimes at St. James's, sometimes with her brother at Hatfield, and it must have been during her visits there to the prince that Sir John Cheke, as tutor to the prince, from time to time gave her some instruction. Her own residence from 1544 and a year or two after appears to have been at one of Sir Antony Denny's houses at Cheshunt, and it was here and at Enfield that young William Grindal, the bishop's namesake, was her tutor, and at Enfield, probably, that he died in 1548 (Strype, *Cheke*, p. 9). This young man seems to have taught her more than any one else, though in her frequent visits to her brother she had the benefit of Cheke's advice and tuition, and once while at Ampthill, whither the prince had gone for change of air, Leland, the great bibliophile, happening to come in to visit his old friend, Cheke asked the princess to address the other in Latin, which to Leland's surprise she did upon the spot, thereby extorting from the old scholar a tribute of admiration in four Latin verses, which Strype has duly preserved (p. 32). It was at Enfield, in presence of her brother, that she received the news of her father's death, 28 Jan. 1547.

Edward VI, when he came to the throne, had three uncles, brothers of his mother, Queen Jane: Sir Edward Seymour [q. v.], earl of Hertford, and afterwards duke of Somerset, and 'protector;' Sir Henry, who lived in obscurity, and died in 1578; and Sir Thomas. Sir Thomas, unless Bishop Latimer was a gratuitous defamer, was a man of profligate life, without a conscience, and without a heart, always needy, and insatiably ambitious. He was somewhat past thirty years of age, of no more than average abilities, but shapely and handsome. In the king's will, while the Earl of Hertford was appointed one of the sixteen executors to whom was entrusted the government of the kingdom during the minority of the young prince, Sir Thomas Seymour was named among the twelve who were to form a council to advise the executors when advice should be needed. Seymour was dissatisfied. On 10 Feb. the Earl of Hertford was created Duke of Somerset, and the younger brother Baron Seymour of Sudeley, with a liberal grant of lands to support his title. Next day he was made lord high admiral of England. The admiral was unmarried. Whom should he choose? There were three who were eligible—three, any one of whom might satisfy even his vaulting ambition—the Princess Mary, now just completing her thirty-second year, the Princess Elizabeth, in her fourteenth year, and the queen dowager, an old love, it might be about thirty-three or thirty-four years of age. Would either of the princesses have him? He was sure of the queen, and could always fall back upon her. He shrank from approaching the Princess Mary. On 26 Feb. he addressed a letter to Elizabeth, offering himself as her husband. On the 27th she wrote in reply, refusing her consent to such an alliance, and declaring that 'even when she shall have arrived at years of discretion she wishes to retain her liberty, without entering into any matrimonial engagement' (Miss Strickland, p. 15). On 3 March it is said he was formally betrothed to the queen dowager, and shortly after this the two were married. The queen was living at Chelsea; the young princess made her home with her stepmother. Soon there came rumours that Seymour had availed himself of his position to indulge in familiarities with the princess which would have been unseemly towards a child of six, and were wholly inexcusable towards a young lady whom he had actually offered to make his wife a few weeks before. The queen remonstrated, and finally the princess removed her household and set up her establishment at Hatfield. On 7 Sept. 1548 the queen died, after giving birth to a daughter a week before. She was no sooner buried than her worthless husband began again his advances to the princess. Elizabeth had a hard game to play; it needed all the caution and craft of a practised diplomatist. She stood alone now. Her suitor was an utterly mercenary and unscrupulous man, who was trying to supersede his own brother and gain for himself something like the supreme power in the state. Elizabeth was the personage upon whom all eyes were fixed. Would Seymour win her? On 16 Jan. 1549 the protector ordered the arrest of his brother on a charge of high treason, and committed him to the Tower. But as the princess had been named only too frequently of late, and had been in some way implicated in the doings of her suitor, the principal persons of her household were arrested also, and she herself was kept under surveillance, and, though at Hatfield, she was treated to some extent as a prisoner under restraint. Then followed examinations and confessions on the part of her servants in the Tower—hearsay stories, backstairs gossip, and all the vulgar tattle of waiting-maids and lackeys. Then the princess herself was questioned. There was nothing to be got from her that did not tend to weaken confidence in the so-called evidence that had been carefully compiled. If the protector had ever any design upon the life of Elizabeth, it may be that the love which her brother bore her saved her from danger. Seymour was brought to the block on 20 March 1549. When they told Elizabeth she did not betray emotion. 'This day died a man with much wit and very little judgment,' she said, and passed on, to the wonder of those who were there to watch and listen and report upon her words and looks and manner.

During the year that followed Elizabeth, living sometimes at Cheshunt, sometimes at Hatfield, suffered much from ill-health. She passed her time of retirement in pursuing her studies. Roger Ascham was her tutor then, and Lady Tyrwhitt, her governess, was not unworthy of the title she had gained, a woman of learning and taste, accomplished, wise, and religious in that age of learned ladies. Ascham's account of her studies during this year is somewhat droll: She had read 'almost the whole of Cicero and a great part of Livy,' says the pedagogue, but 'with me,' he adds. Not a line of the poets from anything that appears. 'Select orations of Isocrates and the tragedies of Sophocles' were her Greek pabulum. She had even dipped into patristic learning, but here she had been restricted to extracts from St. Cyprian. They who know Ascham's 'Scolemaster' know what his method was,

and will understand the significance of those two words 'with me;' and they who know St. Cyprian's writings will wonder how the royal maiden could have deserved to have that christian father's work, 'De Disciplina Virginum,' inflicted upon her. A letter which she wrote to her brother during this year has been preserved, in which she rashly ventured to quote 'Orace;' unfortunately the line happens to be one of the proverbs of Publius Syrus, and probably culled, according to the fashion of the day, from some commonplace book. In the spring of 1551 she appeared again in public, and twice during the month of March she rode in state through the streets of London, gladdening the hearts of the citizens by the splendour of her pageantry. On 11 Oct. the Duke of Somerset was arrested and thrown into the Tower. On 22 Jan. 1552 he was beheaded. Again Elizabeth's name is mentioned, and it is said that attempts had been made to induce her to use her influence on one side or the other, but she held herself aloof from both factions. John Dudley, now duke of Northumberland, had stepped into the place of peril and power which Somerset had filled for five years. The health of the young king was declining Elizabeth tried hard to visit her brother as he lay dying, and when the end came she found herself, equally with her elder sister, struck out of the succession to the throne so far as her brother's will and Northumberland's schemes could effect that object. Edward died at Greenwich on the evening of 6 July 1553. Elizabeth was at Hatfield, Mary was at Hoddesdon, scarce ten miles off. That same night a messenger, slipping through the doubly guarded gates of the palace, rode for his life to Hoddesdon. Mary, with the prompt decision of her race, mounted her horse, and before the morning broke she was beyond the reach of pursuit, safe under the guard of her loyal adherents, and proclaiming herself queen from Kenninghall, the castle of the Howards. Meanwhile commissioners arrived from the Duke of Northumberland to Elizabeth at Hatfield, announcing that Lady Jane Grey had succeeded to the throne, and summoning Elizabeth to court. She pleaded illness; she was unfit for the journey; she could not travel. The Duke of Northumberland and his party had enough upon their hands already; they were content to leave the princess where she was. On 10 July the Lady Jane was proclaimed queen, and made her royal entry into the Tower. On the 13th Northumberland advanced in force against Mary, but soon had to retreat in despair. On the 20th Mary was proclaimed at St. Paul's Cross amid tumultuous rejoicings, and that same day the Lady Jane was stripped of the ensigns of royalty and allowed to retire to Sion House, and Northumberland was thrown into the Tower. On the 29th Elizabeth came riding into London with a huge train, and took up her residence at Somerset House. Next day she passed through Aldgate to meet her sister, and when on 3 Aug. (Wriothesley) the queen made her triumphal entry into the city Elizabeth rode by her side, receiving her full share of the joyful acclamations of the populace. During the next few weeks she seems to have continued residing at Somerset House, though in frequent attendance on Mary. Everywhere and among all classes there was feverish excitement, political and religious. On the 8th Edward VI was buried with some pomp at Westminster. On the 22nd Northumberland was beheaded. On the 24th the old ritual was restored, and the mass sung at St. Paul's and elsewhere. But in London the feeling in favour of the gospellers was very strong, and there was much dissatisfaction at the bringing in of the old order, and especially at the restoration of Bonner to his bishopric. There is a story that Elizabeth for a while inclined to side with the protestant party, and it is said that she actually refused to attend mass at the Queen's Chapel. If it was so, it is at least strange that not a hint of this has reached us except in the letters of Renaud and Noailles. Be it as it may, she certainly appeared at mass on 8 Sept., and on the 30th, when the queen rode from the Tower through the city to her coronation, the Lady Elizabeth and the Lady Anne of Cleves followed her closely 'in another red chariot covered with cloth of silver.' She continued to attend at court. There her position was extremely dangerous; her very legitimacy was almost openly questioned, and when the Duchess of Suffolk was allowed to take precedence of her, as daughter of Mary, sister of Henry VIII, Elizabeth resented the affront and kept her chamber. All kinds of vulgar and mean cabals were made to bring her into discredit, and Paget presumed to wait upon her to inform her of a story that Noailles, the French ambassador, had actually been admitted to private conferences at night in her chamber. The slander received scarce a moment's credence; it seems to have been invented by Renaud, the emperor's ambassador, without the least shadow of foundation in fact.

The next danger was far more serious. Edward Courtenay [q. v.], son of Henry, earl of Devonshire, was of the blood royal, and had been a prisoner in the Tower for nearly fifteen years when Mary came to the throne. He

was handsome, and apparently of taking manners, but he had no sooner been released from the Tower on 3 Aug. 1553 than he gave himself up to a life of the wildest dissipation. The queen treated him with marked favour, but he soon found he had no chance of winning her hand. Then he turned to Elizabeth. The vulgar roué was a puppet in the hands of very cunning plotters. Sir Thomas Wyatt had his plan marked out with clearness. He and his fellow-conspirators would effect a rising, the catholic party should be mastered, Courtenay should marry Elizabeth, and she should be set upon the throne. Would she make common cause with the party of revolt? She behaved with extraordinary wisdom and caution. She would do nothing, say nothing, write nothing which could compromise herself. If they succeeded they could not do without her, if they failed she would not be implicated. The mad and stupid outbreak collapsed, and sickening butchery followed. Gardiner and Renaud thought that nothing had been gained while Elizabeth was allowed to live. The wretched leaders of the miserable rebellion were spared from day to day in the hope of extorting from them some evidence of declaration of Elizabeth's complicity, but there was none forthcoming. Meanwhile she was confined to her apartments in Whitehall, her fate trembling in the balance from time to time. At last on Sunday, 18 March, she was thrown into the Tower. The story of her arrest and her entry into the grim old fortress has been told by Mr. Froude in his very best manner. On 11 April Wyatt met his fate like a man, and with his last words declared Elizabeth innocent of all knowledge of his intended rising. Nevertheless she was kept in the Tower, Gardiner insisting, in season and out of season, that she must needs be sacrificed. It was not so to be. On 19 May she was released from the one prison only to be removed to Woodstock, there to be kept under the custody of Sir Henry Bedingfield (1509?–1583) [q. v.], the same gentleman who had kept watch and ward over Queen Catherine of Arragon at Kimbolton seventeen years before. Sir Henry was a courtier and a gentleman, but he had to obey his stern mistress, and though Elizabeth was under surveillance, and her health suffered from her confinement and the irritation which her captivity occasioned, her daily life was made as tolerable as under the circumstances it could be, and she spent her time pursuing her favourite studies, and in all outward observances of religion she scrupulously conformed to the Roman ritual. So prudently did she conduct herself during this trying time that after six months of detention she was summoned once more to her sister's presence, and at the Christmas festival took her seat at the royal table, and was treated with marked courtesy by King Philip himself, while Mary showed her renewed signs of favour. The queen had hopes of issue now; she could afford to be gracious. While Elizabeth had been languishing at Woodstock Mary had been married on St. James's day (25 July) 1554, and now she persuaded herself that in due time an heir would be born to the throne. Philip was weary of England and his English wife, and on 4 Sept. 1555 he set sail from Dover, and turned his back upon the land and the people that he never ceased to hate (Wriothesley).

All through this horrible year a hideous persecution had been going on. On 7 Sept. Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer were brought up for trial at Oxford. On 16 Oct. the last two were burnt. Two days later Elizabeth, who during the last few months had been in frequent attendance at court, was allowed to leave London, and took her final departure for her favourite residence at Hatfield. The people crowded to see her. She at any rate, they thought, was not to blame for all the blood that had been shed. They cheered her to the echo as she passed. With her usual prudence she made no response or acknowledgment.

At Hatfield she again resumed her studies. Ascham returned there for a while and read Demosthenes with her. Castiglione gave her lessons in Italian, aad Sir Thomas Pope exhibited costly pageants for her amusement, and 'the play of Holofernes' was acted before her, but somewhat coldly received. With Philip away, Mary death-stricken, and Gardiner dead, Elizabeth from this time had only to wait and be still. The next two years of her life were passed in comparative tranquillity. There were stupid attempts at rebellion, Courtenay once more figuring among the plotters (for he had not been thought dangerous enough to make it necessary to slay him when Wyatt and the rest suffered), the ghastly burnings grew fiercer and more frequent, there were famine and misery, proposals of marriage for the hand of the princess first by one then by another. On 18 March 1557 Philip came over to England once more (*ib.*), and Elizabeth seems to have visited her sister during his stay (Strickland, p. 92). A month before she had attended at Whitehall in great state, and in July Philip had departed. On 20 Jan. following Calais was lost, and the English were at last driven out of France, and on that same day the last of Queen Mary's parlia-

ments assembled. There was for a while a flash of indignation which cannot be called loyalty or patriotism. The persecution still went on fiercely and remorselessly, and the people sullenly submitted to what seemed the inevitable. The one hope for a land that God had ceased to guard was the death of the reigning sovereign.

On 17 Nov. 1558, in the grey twilight before sunrise, Mary died. Parliament was sitting. At eight in the morning both houses, as if in expectation of the event, were assembled. A message was sent down from the peers to the lower house requiring the immediate attendance of the commons. Heath, archbishop of York, as chancellor, announced that 'our late sovereign lady Queen Mary' had passed away, and that the lords had determined to proclaim the Lady Elizabeth queen 'without further tract of time.' The thing was done with all due form and ceremony, Sir William Cecil having already prepared the draft of the proclamation which was usual on such occasions. At last it had come!

The nation breathed once more the breath of hope and life. But the outlook and the retrospect as men looked back upon the last six years were enough to fill them with dismay. Death had been striding through the land as if to show he was king indeed. Of late the persecution had fallen upon the lowly, but in the upper ranks what havoc there had been! Cardinal Pole died a few hours after Queen Mary. Nine bishoprics were vacant. Within a month of Mary's decease three more bishops were dead. There was only one duke in England now—Thomas Howard of Norfolk, he too doomed to perish on the block before the new reign was half over. In January 1552 Edward Seymour, duke of Suffolk; in August 1553 John Dudley, duke of Northumberland; in February 1554 Henry Grey, duke of Suffolk, had severally perished upon the scaffold. There was not a woman in England more lonely than Queen Elizabeth when she ascended the throne. Her very enemies had died. Gardiner was dead, the Emperor Charles V had died in September, and now Cardinal Pole lay waiting for his obsequies. Her friends and old suitors had died off; Catherine Parr and Anne of Cleves, Seymour and Courtenay, and within six months of her accession Henry II of France and Pope Paul IV, had gone also. Her nearest blood relation was Henry Carey, afterwards Lord Hunsdon, the only child of her mother's sister. The next heir to the throne was Mary Stuart, nine years her junior, now queen of Scotland, and soon to be queen-consort of France. England had just suffered the deepest humiliation which she had known for centuries. She no longer possessed a yard of land upon the continent; the finances of the country were in a condition which might almost be described as desperate. War and famine and pestilence had brought the people to the lowest point of shame and despondency. Meanwhile men seemed absorbed by their religious differences, though for the most part they knew not what they believed. The hideous facts of the Marian persecution, fresh in the memory of the townsmen, wrung from them deep curses against the pope and his supporters; but the wild plunder of the churches and the furious rapacity of the destroyers in King Edward's days were not yet forgotten, nor likely to be for a while.

Elizabeth had completed her twenty-fifth year. Never had royal maiden more need of wisdom, caution, decision, and courage. Never had one in her station received a severer schooling in the arts of dissimulation, reticence, and self-control. Of the domestic affections she had scarcely had experience from her childhood. In her third year her mother had been slain on infamous charges, her father had been always a name of terror, her sister had watched her with the dark suspicion of dislike. Her brother is said to have had some love for her, but in such matters a very little evidence often goes a very long way. There is nothing, absolutely nothing, to show that Elizabeth had a heart, nothing to indicate that she ever for a moment knew the thrill of sentiment, the storms of passion, or the throbs of tenderness. The key to much that is perplexing in her conduct as queen may be found in a careful study of her experience and her discipline as princess and presumptive heir to the throne.

Elizabeth was at Hatfield when her sister died. On 20 Nov. the council met there for the first time; Sir William Cecil was at once appointed chief secretary; his brother-in-law, Sir Nicholas Bacon, his kinsman, Sir Thomas Parry, and Ambrose Carr, who probably was also akin to him (for he too was a Stamford man), were made members of the council; so too were Francis, earl Russell, whose father had been lord-admiral in Queen Mary's time, and William, marquis of Northampton, brother of Queen Catherine Parr, and others, whose sentiments favoured the reformers. The queen's utterances on this memorable day have been preserved; they may be authentic, and they may have been strictly her own. The gift of speech she always had, and she always rose to an occasion. On the 23rd the queen commenced her progress to London. On the way the bishops met her, and were permitted to kiss hands, all except Bonner—from him she turned away

as if there had been blood upon his lips. On the 28th she took possession of the Tower; on 5 Dec. she removed to Somerset House, where she attended the sittings of her council from day to day. Meanwhile the two religious parties were watching her every movement, look, and word with feverish excitement. On the 14th Queen Mary was buried at Westminster according to the Roman ritual. Ten days later the obsequies of Charles V were celebrated after the same fashion, and on the 28th again Christopherson, the late bishop of Chichester, was buried with much ceremonial at Christ Church, five of the bishops offering and two of them singing the mass. On the other hand, on 1 Jan., being Sunday, the English litany was read in the London churches in accordance with a royal proclamation, and the epistle and gospel were read in English at mass by order of the lord mayor. Which side was going to win? The bishops were strangely unanimous, but they overestimated their strength. The oath of allegiance contained one clause which had been handed down from Elizabeth's father; it spoke of the sovereign as supreme head of the church. That clause was hateful to a catholic. Heath, the archbishop of York, protested, the other bishops followed him to a man. But the coronation was fixed for 15 Jan. All, it seemed, would refuse to place the crown upon the queen's head. At the eleventh hour Watson, bishop of Lincoln, gave way. The mass was sung as of old, but only one bishop was there. The gospel was read in Latin and English; it was significant—a sign of compromise.

On the 25th the queen opened parliament; again high mass was celebrated at the altar at Westminster, but after it was over Dr. Cox, an exile for religion in Queen Mary's reign, preached the sermon. The parliament had enough upon its hands. On 10 Feb. it was ordered that Mr. Speaker with all the privy council and thirty members of the House of Commons should attend upon the queen to petition her majesty touching her marriage. Her answer is well known. She had already refused the hand of Philip II, and now she declared, what she had declared more than once before, that she had no inclination for marriage, and she ended her speech with the memorable words: 'This shall be for me sufficient, that a marble stone shall declare that a queen, having reigned such a time, died a virgin' (D'Ewes, p. 46). The faithful commons voted money lavishly, gave back to the queen all that Mary had surrendered to the religious orders which she had attempted to revive, confirmed her deposition of the recalcitrant bishops, voted that all the temporalities of vacant sees should be handed over to her during a vacancy; they showed her that she could depend upon them even to the utmost, that she was in fact, though not in name, an absolute sovereign. On 8 May parliament was dissolved, and on the 12th the English service was first said in the Queen's Chapel, four days before the date appointed by act of parliament for it to be used.

Meanwhile Cecil and the council had been exhibiting astonishing activity. Sir Thomas Gresham had been commissioned to negotiate a loan abroad. What money could be got was borrowed at home. Peace was concluded with France on 12 March, on terms far better than could have been expected, and if about the same time Mary Stuart thought proper to assume the royal arms of England, and to induce her puny boy husband to call himself king of France, Scotland, England, and Ireland, the fact would not be forgotten, though the act need not be noticed. On the last day of that same month of March the great controversy between the champions of the old faith and the new took place in Westminster Abbey. The result was by this time felt to be a foregone conclusion. The catholic bishops were sent to the Tower. On 15 May they were all called upon to take the oath of supremacy. All except Kitchin of Llandaff refused, the rest had time given them to reconsider their decision, and they availed themselves of the delay. The court was all astir with festivities from day to day, the queen showing herself in wonderful attire, dazzling her subjects with the splendour of her dresses and her jewellery; there were masques and pageants, and tiltings and plays and banquets; the queen in her progresses going from house to house received magnificent entertainment at the charge of the owners of the several mansions. On 5 Sept. the obsequies of Henry II of France, who had died in July, were celebrated with great pomp in St. Paul's, and the first three of the four bishops-elect, Parker of Canterbury, Scory of Hereford, and Barlow of Chichester, appeared in public in black gowns. Grindal of London, the fourth bishop-elect (Bonner had been deposed), being ill, was absent. Nevertheless, on 1 Nov., to the horror and dismay of the protestants, lighted tapers were seen in broad daylight in the royal chapel, and once more the crucifix in silver was set up upon the altar there. Of late there had come the emissaries of at least three suitors for the hand of the queen. Eric of Sweden, a dissipated young prince, had sent his brother to plead his cause. Adolphus, duke of Hol-

stein, had come in person to urge his own suit. The archduke Charles was warmly supported by all the catholics in England, and not less warmly by Philip of Spain. Elizabeth amused herself with each and all of them, played off one against the other, and dressed up her chapel to give some colour of hope to the archduke, whom De Quadra clearly saw she never intended to marry. But the settlement of the religious difficulty was not to be delayed by freaks like these. On 17 Dec. the church of England was provided with an archbishop of Canterbury once more by the consecration of Matthew Parker at Lambeth. Four days later Edmund Grindal was consecrated bishop of London in the place of Bonner, Cox became bishop of Ely in the place of Thirlby, Sandys was made bishop of Worcester in the place of Pate, and Meyrick succeeded to the vacant see of Bangor, whose revenues were not worth the queen's keeping any longer in her hands. A month after this five more bishops were consecrated; but the wealthy sees of York, Winchester, and Durham had each to wait for another year. The necessities of the time forbade that their income should be lost to the royal exchequer, though their bishops were already deprived.

Thus ended the first year of Elizabeth's reign. It was the first year since the death of Henry VIII which had not been signalised by some serious rebellion, some ghastly massacre, or some national disaster. Already the horizon was clearing on all sides, a feeling of security was growing among all classes, except indeed among the turbulent minority in church and state, the politicians whose hopes lay in some change from the things that were to the things that might be. They had begun to feel that at last the queen was a veritable ruler, her council were her servants, she was no puppet in their hands. Her immense force of will, the masculine vigour of her intellect, her instinct of command, her very duplicity, her restlessness, her insatiable desire to be kept informed of everything that was going on, her pretence of omniscience, her resolve to initiate, or seem to initiate, every movement in church and state, at home and abroad, were each and all factors that had to be taken into account by her ministers, and had already displayed themselves too evidently to allow of their escaping the notice of her council. There was not one of these who did not tremble at her frown as they would have done if they had stood in her father's presence twenty years before. At home there was little or nothing to cause anxiety when the year 1560 opened; abroad Philip II was her ally, and half the young princes of Europe were seeking her hand; but while between Scotland and France there was still the semblance of cordiality, and at any rate community of interest, sentiment, and purpose, Elizabeth could not afford to remain quiet, or she thought she could not.

When James IV of Scotland was slain at Flodden, his son, James V, was a child just two years old. His mother was Margaret, daughter of Henry VII, and therefore sister of Henry VIII. James V died on 18 Dec. 1542, leaving behind him an only daughter, Mary Stuart. Her mother was the bright and gifted Mary of Lorraine, who after the Earl of Arran's desertion of Scotland in 1554 had become regent of the kingdom. Her daughter had been carried off to France in 1548, and been married to the dauphin. On 29 June 1559 the dauphin became king, and Mary Stuart queen-consort of France. The treaty of peace between France, England, and Scotland had been signed at Château Cambresis on 2 April 1559; next day a second treaty was signed between France and Spain. The peace marked an era in European history, though it is more than doubtful whether any one of the contending parties seriously intended to keep the engagements entered into, or felt the smallest confidence in the promises of the others. But France and Spain were united in one common sentiment at least, the desire to resist and beat back the spirit of the age. While Elizabeth read the signs of the times with more foresight and sagacity, she saw that society was fermenting with the reformers' leaven, and that in the contest that was coming the catholics would surely lose the day. Cautiously—we might almost call it cunningly—she took her side with the protestant party in England, Scotland, and France. Cecil was so much one with her in feeling and views, that it is hard to say whether she or he was the originator of all that was attempted; but Elizabeth was far more a creature of moods and caprice than her astute minister. She loved intrigue for its own sake; he resorted to it, and practised it with an end kept clearly before him. It was in July 1559 that Elizabeth seems to have given something like an engagement to support the protestant party in Scotland. In the next few months troops were sent and money in insufficient quantities; then a fleet under Admiral Winter arrived at the Firth of Forth in January 1560; then half-hearted warfare, no one venturing to make a decided move, lest the queen should disown his act. At last Cecil himself went to Scotland (May). On 6 July the treaty of Edinburgh was signed. What had been gained was not much: (1) Mary Stuart was to give up using the arms and title of

queen of England; (2) the French were to quit Scotland; (3) the protestant party were to be delivered from the presence of the foreign auxiliaries, and left to fight their own battle; lastly, and this was perhaps the most important of all (Cecil at Edinburgh, 15 July, *Cal.* Scotland, i. 158; also *Cal.* Hatfield, I. No. 782), Philip II had been taught that Elizabeth could do without him, and could stand alone. Cecil was back again at court in July; in his absence he had lost favour. It seems the queen had a suspicion that he had taken too much upon himself, and that he might have made better terms. But everybody was plotting against him. And each little knot of politicians had its own card to play in the shape of a suitor for the hand of the queen. The Scotch were for pressing her to marry Arran now. She would have none of him, and as for the rest she kept her own counsel.

Ever since she came to the throne Elizabeth's most signal marks of favour were displayed towards Robert Dudley [q. v.], now master of the horse, a member of the privy council, and never absent from his royal mistress's side, although he had been married to Amy Robsart in King Edward's days, and his wife was living. The queen made no secret of her preference for the handsome young courtier. She even overacted the part of love-sick maiden, till the quidnuncs whispered and told infamous tales, and half Europe believed them. There was one man in England who put no faith in her only too demonstrative professions of affection, and that man was Robert Dudley himself. A month after Cecil's return Amy Robsart was found dead (8 Sept. 1560) at Cumnor. There was an inquest, and an attempt to implicate her husband in her unhappy death. The queen saw clearly enough that the attempt to fasten suspicion on Sir Robert was a mere court intrigue; she made no change in her conduct towards the favourite. The familiarities went on as before. One of the most important measures of 1560, and one in which the queen showed great interest, and gave remarkable proof of her versatility, was the reform of the currency and the calling in of the debased coinage of the last three reigns. As early as January 1559 this important reform had been mooted (*Hatfield MSS.* vol. i. Nos. 566, 567), but the scheme then suggested had fallen through. Now a well-considered plan was adopted and executed in a very masterly manner (see *Cal.* Dom. 1547–80, pp. 159–161; Froude, vol. vii. chap. vi.) It was during this year, too, that the abbey of Westminster was converted into a collegiate church. John Feckenham [q. v.], the last abbot, who had been appointed by Queen Mary, was deprived in 1559, and William Bill [q.v.], was installed dean, and instructed to draw up statutes for the new corporation. But the most notable event of the year was the death of Francis II, Mary Stuart's young husband, and the seizing of the reins of government in France by Catherine de' Medici. England was getting more content month by month, and for a year or two the royal suitors for the queen's hand kept from any serious advances. De Quadra had persuaded himself and Philip II that the queen meant to marry Dudley. It is probable that Elizabeth and he understood one another, and were amusing themselves with De Quadra, who took all that he saw or heard *au grand sérieux*. In August 1561 Mary Stuart, eluding the English fleet which had been ordered to watch her and prevent her landing, returned to Scotland, and the great troubles of her life began. In France there was civil war, in Spain persecution, in Scotland almost anarchy; in the Netherlands deep discontent, ready before long to burst into a flame. England was quiet and prosperous; Elizabeth living a gay and merry life, but always vigilant, alert, equal to any emergency, and every now and then startling even to terror such as presumed to take a course of their own. So, when the luckless Lady Catherine Grey ventured upon a clandestine marriage with the Earl of Hertford; or the Countess of Lennox dared to assert herself or to deal in curious arts; or Mary Stuart demanded to have her title to the succession acknowledged; or the pope actually went some way towards sending a nuncio to England to induce, if it might be so, the queen to send a representative to the council of Trent—Lady Catherine, her husband, and the Countess of Lennox were sent to the Tower; Mary Stuart received a curt repulse; the nuncio was not permitted to cross the sea.

Meanwhile Elizabeth had been induced to meddle with the struggle that was going on in France. There the Calvinists and the catholics were at very bitter feud. The civil war was beginning. Condé, the leader of the Calvinists, implored the help of Elizabeth; he offered to surrender to her the towns of Havre and Dieppe as the price of her support and as pledges for the restoration of Calais. She promised, hesitated, delayed; finally, on 4 Oct., Sir Adrian Poynings with three thousand English troops took possession of Havre. Five hundred of these men tried to cut their way into Rouen, which Guise was besieging. A few succeeded, only to perish miserably for the most part, when on 26 Oct. Guise took the place by storm. Next

month Dudley's brother, Ambrose, earl of Warwick [q.v.], took the command at Havre. Then followed the bloody battle of Dreux on 19 Dec., and the peace of Amboise on 25 March 1563. The civil war was at an end. But Elizabeth refused to surrender Havre. She could not bear to part with it, she could not bring herself to pay the price of keeping it, money she never could be persuaded to spend, and a war with France meant enormous cost. But Havre was surrendered at last on 27 July, only after the garrison had suffered frightfully from plague and famine; and Warwick brought back the remnant of his force to England, and with it the pestilence which spread far and wide through the land. There was the less excuse for the parsimony which Elizabeth showed at this juncture, for the parliament which assembled on 12 Jan. had again been liberal, and had voted one subsidy besides two fifteenths and tenths to replenish the exchequer. But one act of this parliament marked an epoch in the history of the reign, and another act of convocation was no less important in its bearing upon the ecclesiastical history of England. The first was the act for forcing the oath of supremacy upon a much larger class than had been compelled to take it heretofore, and visiting persistent refusal with the penalty of death as in cases of treason. The second was the promulgation of the Thirty-nine Articles as formulating the recognised doctrines of the English church. The latter measure concerned the clergy, the former was a sword of Damocles that was suspended over the heads of all classes of the laity, but it is to the credit of the queen that she was averse to putting it in action. The time had not come for using the awful power that this act placed in her hands. Once more during this parliament, and only a few days after it assembled, the faithful commons had presented a humble petition to Elizabeth 'to take to yourself some honourable husband whom it shall please you to join unto in marriage.' They were deeply in earnest this time, for the country had had a serious scare in the previous October, when the queen had been dangerously ill with the small-pox, and her life for some hours had seemed to be trembling in the balance. As before to this petition an evasive answer was returned. About this time the marriage of the Queen of Scots became a subject of debate among the politicians. Elizabeth suggested that her favourite Dudley should become Mary Stuart's husband. It ended by the marriage to Darnley on 29 July 1565. On the wearisome intrigues which had as their object the marriage of Elizabeth herself it is not worth while to dwell. In 1564 the famous visit to Cambridge took place, and it was on this occasion that Elizabeth made her Latin speech, which there is every reason to believe she delivered without any careful preparation. A month later Dudley at last received his patent of nobility, and on 29 Sept. was created Earl of Leicester, with the gift of the manor of Kenilworth. Was Cecil chancellor of Cambridge? Then Leicester should be chancellor of Oxford, and two years after Elizabeth had visited the one university she was received with the same pomp and magnificence at the other. It was during this visit that on 3 Sept. she listened to Edmund Campion and Richard Bristow disputing in the schools, few thinking then that the two would become hereafter the great champions of the catholic party. In Scotland, meanwhile, all was turbulence, violence, and misrule. Rizzio was murdered on 9 March with every circumstance of brutal ferocity, and on 19 June Mary Stuart brought forth a son, and there was an heir male to the throne at last. The parliament met again on 30 Sept. Again there was a petition from the lords that the queen would name her successor, and would consent to take to herself a husband, this time with more earnestness than ever (D'Ewes, p. 105). Elizabeth's answer was as it had always been, that she was averse to marriage in itself, and she would never marry if she could avoid it. But once more the archduke Charles made serious advances, and once more he was encouraged to proceed.

Meanwhile Sir Henry Sidney, Leicester's brother-in-law, had been eating his heart out in Ireland, forced to go there, and forced to stay against his wish and better judgment; and though the commons had again been bountiful, Elizabeth could by no means be persuaded to do the one thing needful, namely to supply men and money and supplies to the deputy, and thus enable him to bring Shaen O'Neil to his senses. She behaved in all this miserable business as meanly as a sovereign of a great nation could behave. She set herself stubbornly against her council even when they were unanimous. She put forth plans of her own, she wrote outrageous letters; and when at last Sidney's brilliant campaign had been carried through with complete success, and was followed in the summer of 1567 by the utter discomfiture of O'Neil, and by his savage murder in a characteristic Irish brawl and massacre, she grudgingly wrote to thank Sidney for his services, as if the acknowledgment had been wrung from her at the last moment. While Sidney was doing his work so well in Ireland,

strange things were happening nearer home. On 2 Jan. 1567 parliament was dissolved. Next month the country was horrified by the news that Darnley, titular king of the Scots, had been barbarously and deliberately murdered, and that the Earl of Bothwell was believed to have been the instigator of the crime. Two months later it was known that Bothwell and Mary Stuart were living together at Dunbar; then that he had divorced his wife; then that the two had been married on 15 May; and then followed the news of the day at Carberry Hill, and on 17 June the imprisonment of 'the mother of debate' in the castle of Lochleven. Meanwhile across the Channel the civil war in France was raging, the catholics were carrying all before them, and in the Netherlands Alva was expected to supersede the regent Margaret. In August 1567 he entered Brussels, and some bloody work began. When the year 1568 opened there were clouds upon the horizon; before it closed Mary Stuart was a captive in England, war with Spain seemed imminent, the English ambassador had been expelled from Spain, the Spanish treasure-ships had been seized, and Elizabeth had declared that she meant to keep the treasure in safe custody; what she would do with it time would show. On 26 Jan. 1569 Mary Stuart was removed from Lord Scrope's castle at Bolton to the care of Lord Shrewsbury at Tutbury (*Hatfield MSS.* i. 395). The Queen of Scots, though under vigilant supervision, had a household of ten ladies and fifty other persons, with ten horses. Liberal as this treatment may seem at first sight, it still remains a question at whose charge this household was kept up. Lord Shrewsbury, it is certain, was full of complaints at the great expense he was put to. Elizabeth, if she ever repaid him, did not do so without much reluctance and many reminders. Mary's husband was still living in Denmark; but he, too, was in safe custody. The marriage between him and the queen was treated as invalid, though there were rumours that a divorce might be necessary, and could be easily obtained. But what was to be done with her? To send her back to Scotland would be, some said, to send her back to certain destruction; some said it would be to make the northern land more French than ever. Certainly it would be to plunge it deeper than ever into sanguinary civil war. On the other hand, to keep her in England, which she had voluntarily fled to as an asylum, was to assure her personal safety at the cost of a thousand risks and dangers which were obvious to any one who could form an estimate of the political outlook of the times wherever one turned.

It was not long (1569) before the first of these dangers showed itself. The Duke of Norfolk was unmarried. If he was not an avowed catholic, at any rate he was regarded as the head of the catholic party, and he was a personage round whom the catholic party would rally; they were still a powerful faction; in the north they were very powerful. Bothwell's name was hardly mentioned. The suspicion which the Casket letters had cast upon Mary's complicity in Darnley's murder might make Norfolk's pillow uncomfortable for him; but as to her having another husband alive at Copenhagen scribbling letters to her day after day (*Cal. State Papers*, Scotland, 1509–89, p. 310, No. 5), that seems hardly to have occurred to him as a matter to concern himself about. So the duke, in a vacillating, half-hearted, languid way, consented to be named as a suitor to the Queen of Scots. Of course Elizabeth heard of it, taxed him with it, threw him into the Tower, found that there was no evidence to convict him of anything more than a matrimonial plot, released him in August 1570, but continued to keep him under supervision. The great northern rebellion—the story of which has been so splendidly told by Mr. Froude—broke out in November. If the catholic party had had competent leaders, the issue might easily have proved calamitous for the country; as it was, the leadership and the energy were all on the other side. Even so there was room for anxiety and much need for promptness of decision, rapidity of action, and entire readiness to cooperate in any course that might be resolved on. But during all the crisis Elizabeth kept up a continual whimpering at the great charges she was being put to. She felt not the smallest anxiety about herself; she was sure that the result would be the discomfiture of the rebels; it was deplorable and vexatious that the cost of scourging them should be so heavy. She would have preferred that her nobles should rush upon these troublesome rioters with their riding-whips, as the Scythians served their mutinous slaves in old times; that would have been cheaper. Her nobles succeeded in quelling the dangerous outbreak in spite of their royal mistress, and when the time of punishment came they were encouraged to recoup themselves at the cost of those who might be implicated in the rising. Nothing in Elizabeth's life is more dreadful than the acllous savagery which she permitted, and more than permitted, in the slaughter and pillage that followed the northern rebellion. She heard of it all, and did as her father would have done in the fury of his wrath.

Then there rose a cry that if the pope had

but supported the rebellion and boldly excommunicated the queen the catholics would have answered to the call as one man. Rome has always moved slowly, but Rome was preparing to move now. On 25 Feb. 1570 Pope Pius V issued the bull, 'Regnans in Excelsis,' excommunicating Elizabeth by name, and absolving her subjects from any oath of allegiance that might have been taken to her at any previous time. She had been upon her throne eleven years and three months when this famous sentence was passed, and the importance of the event at the time can hardly be exaggerated. The news was soon known in England, but the bull was not published till 15 May. Then it was found in the morning nailed to the Bishop of London's palace gate, in defiance of queen, parliament, and all the powers that be. John Felton, the poor wretch who had dared to do the deed, was soon taken and soon hung, glorying in the act with his last breath. And yet the immediate effect of the sentence of excommunication was almost absurdly small. In London people were more scornful than in any other way concerned, and when the parliament assembled in April 1571 it proved much more protestant than had ever been known before. There were loud complaints against the laxity with which the laws against the papists had been carried out, and one act, which had passed both houses, though it was aimed at the catholic lords, was too much for the queen in her present mood to give her assent to, and it dropped. But though Elizabeth could be tolerant of beliefs she did not share in, or considerate to a whole order whom it was policy to conciliate, she had no pity for *persons*, whether high or low, who provoked her anger or vengeance. The treacherous capture of John Storey and his execution this year is an instance of her relentless severity where only a single person had to suffer; and the fate of the Duke of Norfolk seems to be best explained by looking upon it as an easy way of getting rid of a timid imbecile who could be sacrificed without any inconveniences being likely to follow, while, if he were allowed to live, he might prove troublesome as an instrument in abler hands.

When Mary Stuart had been two years in England, it seems that Elizabeth had grown tired of keeping her, and would have been glad to be rid of her, if only she could have seen her way to release her. There were some who boldly urged that the Gordian knot would be best unravelled by the executioner's sword; but little was to be gained by that when across the border there was still the little prince, James VI, with at least as good a title to the English crown as his mother's, and who in the hands of the politicians would be a better card to play than Mary Stuart had ever been.

Exactly at this juncture came in another of those complications which make the problems of this reign so intricate, and the course of the chief actors so difficult to explain. Hitherto deliberate plots for the assassination of an English sovereign had very rarely been dreamt of. Now, for the first time, we hear the whisper of such base conspiracies. It was when the Ridolfi plot was growing, and miscreants in high places half over Europe were suggesting this or that scheme for the overthrow of the queen of England, that we first hear of a design for compassing her murder. The ruffian who volunteered to do the deed was no common bravo, but a man of high birth, and an officer who had served with energy under Alva in the Netherlands. This was Chapin Vitelli, marquis of Cretona; he had been sent over in October 1569 to negotiate for the restitution of the treasure which Elizabeth persisted in keeping in her own custody. It is not improbable that even thus early he intended on his own responsibility to carry out the assassination, for he set out with a suite of sixty gentlemen, of whom only five were permitted to proceed further than Dover. From the first the man was regarded with suspicion, and he was dismissed in December, having effected nothing. But when the Ridolfi plot was not only advancing to maturity but seemed likely to result in a real rebellion, Vitelli was once more to the fore. Two months later the Ridolfi plot had been discovered, the Duke of Norfolk was again in the Tower, and on 2 June following (1572) he suffered on the scaffold. For the credit of Elizabeth it should be noted that to the last she shrank from signing the warrant for the execution, and did so only under much pressure, not only of her council but of her parliament. The Ridolfi plot had shown that the sympathies of a large section of the nobility were catholic; the plot meant murder, and had scarcely been discovered in its fulness when it was found that Don Gueran, the Spanish ambassador, had hired another band of cutthroats to assassinate Cecil, and Northumberland was at large across the border. Nevertheless when the parliament presumed to express an opinion as to what her next step ought to be, and strongly urged the stern necessity of getting rid of the difficulty of Mary Stuart by bringing her to the block, Elizabeth forbade them to proceed with their bill of attainder; and when both houses persisted in passing a measure which rendered Mary incapable of succeeding to the throne in the event of her surviving the queen reg-

nant of England, the royal assent was withheld, and the parliament was prorogued.

In September 1567 the civil war again broke out in France. Again the Huguenots were worsted; again there was peace, both sides anxious to gain time. Next year (September, *Cal.* Dom. 1547–80, pp. 3–6) the Cardinal Chatillon, Coligny's brother, slipped away to England to gain the ear of Elizabeth. He seems to have had some money given him for the cause, little enough we may be sure (*Hatfield MSS.* i. 404, No. 1287), but he returned in November with fair promises (Nos. 1207–8). Elizabeth intended to help the Huguenots at Rochelle (*Cal.* Dom. 1547–80, p. 318, No. 92). In the spring of 1569 the war broke out with the old fury. This time Condé was opposed by Henry, duke of Anjou, brother of Charles IX and afterwards Henry III. On 13 March, at the battle of Jarnac, Condé died the death of a hero. Anjou, now in his nineteenth year, won well-deserved laurels. The protestant cause appeared desperate. Coligny and his brother Dandelot alone remained. It was Jeanne d'Albret, wife of Antony, king of Navarre, who gave the cause a new life. When least expected she appeared at Saintes, where the remains of the protestant forces were, with her son, Henry of Navarre, and the boy of fifteen was welcomed as the commander of the Huguenot armies. The peace of St. Germain (8 Aug. 1570) was a pretence of settlement once more, giving the Huguenots a certain measure of toleration and four cities of refuge, of which Rochelle was the most important. The policy of conciliation for a time prevailed. Charles offered his sister Margaret to young Henry of Navarre, and the hand of his brother, the Duke of Anjou, to the queen of England. This was in April 1571. Elizabeth was in her thirty-eighth year, Anjou was twenty. She amused herself with the new negotiations. While they were going on the evil day for the Huguenots was postponed. But Anjou was not the man to be used as a plaything. If he saw his way to a crown and something more, he would sacrifice himself. When he became convinced that the queen meant nothing serious, he threw her over, July 1571. In October Catherine de' Medici, the queen mother, was offering her youngest son, the Duke d'Alençon, as a substitute for his brother. The negotiations dropped for a while, but were renewed in February 1572, and continued from month to month, Catherine de' Medici being desperately in earnest, Elizabeth at this time scarcely pretending to be sincere. On 8 May parliament had assembled; on the 29th the Earl of Northumberland was sold by the Scots, after much higgling about the price to be paid, and delivered into the hands of Lord Hunsdon at Berwick. Hunsdon hated the vile business, and when an order came from the queen that he must carry his prisoner to execution at York he flatly refused to obey. The hateful office fell to another, and on 22 Aug. Northumberland was sacrificed.

The horrible tidings of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 24 Aug. 1572, reached Elizabeth at Woodstock. At first she refused to give the French ambassador an audience. When she did she received him with impressive solemnity of manner, the whole court being dressed in deep mourning. The lords of the council turned away from the representative of the king of France with coldness and silence; but the ambassador himself actually, at this very audience, ventured to present the queen with a love-letter from the Duke d'Alençon, which we are told she not only accepted but read there and then!

The year of the St. Bartholomew massacre marks an epoch in the life and reign of Queen Elizabeth. With this year begins that long episode in the queen's life which goes by the name of the Alençon marriage. Francis, duke d'Alençon, was a hideous dwarf. In childhood he had escaped from the small-pox with his life, but the foul disease had left him blotched and scarred and stunted. A frightful enlargement at the end of his nose had divided into two, and the wits of the time made themselves merry with his 'double nose,' apt symbol, they said, of his double-facedness. Like all his brothers, he was licentious and unscrupulous. He had little education, and no religious principle, at one time siding with the catholic party, at another posing as a Huguenot leader in France, or accepting the sovereignty of the states of the Netherlands under conditions which he never meant to observe. His pock-marked face and discoloured skin as he dropped into a seat made him look like a frog, and Elizabeth called him, and he cheerfully accepted the name, her 'petite grenouille.' This was the lover whom the queen of England kept hoping and languishing for twelve long years, and whom, when he died, worn out by debauchery, on 9 June 1584, Elizabeth declared she had loved so entirely that she could not in his place accept the hand of the hero, Henry of Navarre. Three times he came to England. She kissed his lips in the presence of the French ambassador, of Walsingham, and of Leicester. In November 1581 she let it go forth to the whole of Europe that she would marry at last. Lord Burghley, in his own hand, drew up a digest of the incidents con-

nected with the courtship, from its beginning in June 1572 till November 1579. We have less cause to regret that he did not continue the narrative; for in the archives of Hatfield there are still preserved more than one hundred love-letters that passed between the two, as amorous as were ever read at a trial for breach of promise. When the negotiations first began Elizabeth was in her fortieth year; when the prince died she was close upon fifty-two. Was it all mere acting? Was it a case of absolute infatuation? This only is certain, that Elizabeth was never so near marrying any one as she was to marrying this persistent suitor, and that if she was playing a part throughout, she overacted that part till she had wellnigh overreached herself. And all this while Leicester, whom men believed she loved, and Hatton, who pretended towards her a fervent passion, were daily at her side, and receiving substantial proofs of her power. They, too, were offering to her the incense of their coarsest flattery, deceiving or being deceived. It is not the least curious feature in her dealings with Alençon that only in his favour did she ever exhibit any generosity as far as money was concerned.

While amusing herself with this extraordinary lover, Elizabeth had no opportunity for idle languishing. In Scotland matters came to a crisis when Edinburgh Castle was surrendered to Sir William Drury in June 1573, with a force which Elizabeth tried hard but vainly to induce the regent Morton [see Douglas, James, *d.* 1581] to pay for. From this day the cause of Mary Stuart in Scotland was utterly hopeless. She was safer in her English captivity than she could ever again hope to be on the other side of the border. A month after the fall of Edinburgh the luckless Walter Devereux, earl of Essex, set sail for Ireland on that wild expedition which proved his ruin. The cost was to be borne partly by the earl, partly by the queen; but he mortgaged his estates heavily to Elizabeth before he started, and when he died he was a broken man. It was, however, in her conduct towards the protestant insurgents in the Netherlands, who had now begun their heroic struggle with the king of Spain, that Elizabeth's dealings were most tortuous. Burghley and the rest of the council were unanimous in desiring that the States should be strenuously supported as the champions of the protestant cause. Burghley had a foreign policy clear and defined. That policy was to weaken the power of Spain and France abroad, and to crush the hopes of the catholics at home by decidedly and consistently taking the side of those who were fighting for liberty of conscience, and were staking their all in a determined struggle with the pope and the Inquisition. Elizabeth herself had no policy; she was absolutely destitute of ambition; she clung to all she had; she never wished for more. War she hated, primarily because of the cost, and that meant an application to parliament for supplies. A war of conquest for the sake of annexing a province or extending her dominions nothing on earth would have induced her to engage in. Leadership had no attraction for her. She put away from her mind all thoughts about the future. She would live and die an island queen. The children of Henry VIII were the only sovereigns of England since the Conquest who had never crossed the Channel. Elizabeth never saw Scotland, Ireland, or Wales; indeed her yearly progresses were as a rule mere visits to the houses of the nobility in the home counties and the midlands. When she reached Bristol in 1574 she offered up special thanks to God for her preservation in that long and dangerous journey (*Lansdowne MSS.* cxv. 45). A detailed itinerary of her movements, such as exists for the reigns of Henry II and King John, would amuse the reader by showing the smallness of the area in which she lived during her seventy years. All this tended to make her narrow in her views of what was going on in the great world outside her. Intensely self-involved she looked at everything as it might affect her own purse and her own convenience, while her magnificent fearlessness kept away all anxieties about the future. But as to committing herself to a great cause she was incapable of understanding what it meant. From Burghley's point of view the revolted provinces were the battle-ground between protestantism and papistry. Elizabeth regarded the Flemings as mere rebels, whom she would have left to settle their own affairs with their sovereign if her council had allowed her. As for the pope or the king of Spain, it would be time enough to trouble herself about them when the one should dare to invade her dominions with his secret emissaries, or the other should try conclusions with her on the coast or in the Channel.

From the moment that William of Nassau was elected stadtholder of the United Provinces in 1572 Elizabeth's feeling towards him was not friendly. In England generally there was profound and enthusiastic sympathy with him in the struggle on which he had embarked. Immense sums were subscribed for his support; he was regarded as the hero on whose success the cause of protestantism depended. Elizabeth regarded him and his Flemings as being engaged in a great rebellion against their lawful sovereign. There

was, however, a danger that if she would not support the United Provinces France might step in; that was to be avoided. She determined to give help, and Sir Humphrey Gilbert landed at Flushing on 9 July 1572 (Wright, i. 425) with a force of volunteers better furnished than ordinarily with arms and money, though the expedition seems to have been fitted out at the expense of the merchants of London. The force was allowed to join the insurgents. Shortly after this Elizabeth had made up her differences with Philip, the dispute about the treasure seized in 1568 had been settled, and in November Sir Humphrey was recalled. Next year Alva was succeeded in the government of the Netherlands by Requesens, and Elizabeth undertook to act as peacemaker between Philip II and the provinces. The Prince of Orange refused to entertain the proposals she made, but when all hope of aid from the French Huguenots disappeared he prevailed upon the States to offer the sovereignty of the Netherlands to Elizabeth herself, as the lineal descendant of Philippa of Hainault, and so the representative of the ancient sovereigns of the land. She appeared to hesitate; finally she refused the tempting offer. Requesens died in July 1575. For seventeen months the provinces were left to be governed by the council of state. Practically there was anarchy. The Spanish troops were left unpaid; they made requisitions upon the miserable people, and plundered town after town with remorseless atrocities. On 3 Nov. they sacked Antwerp. Almost the wealthiest city in Europe was given over to fire and pillage. On that same day a new governor arrived in Luxemburg, Don Juan of Austria, a natural brother of Philip II, and the hero of the battle of Lepanto. He began by dismissing the Spanish army, and ratified the pacification of Ghent; but it was plain that the Netherlands could not be ruled except by the sword. The Spanish and Italian troops returned, and the old horrors began again. In March 1578 Sir John Norris was allowed to cross over to join the Prince of Orange with two thousand men, but again they were mere volunteers; the queen would not commit herself, or contribute to the expense. On 1 Oct. Don Juan died suddenly, and was succeeded by the Duke of Parma, son of the regent Margaret. But Don Juan's mission was not in vain, for it was he who succeeded in dissociating the ten southern provinces from the seven Dutch provinces in the north. The former became united again to Spain, and constitute the modern kingdom of Belgium; the latter, the protestant provinces, now make up the kingdom of Holland.

We have seen that very early in her reign Elizabeth had prohibited under the severest penalties the saying of the mass in public or private, and had made it compulsory for all her subjects to attend the English service in the churches. The Statute of Uniformity came into force on 24 June 1559, but it was allowed to remain for the most part inoperative. The immediate effect, however, was to drive a large number of men of learning and ability into exile, and to strip the university of Oxford of its most brilliant scholars. A colony of them settled at Louvain, and soon set themselves to work to write pungent attacks upon the protestant doctrines and exasperating treatises in the vernacular in defence of the catholic dogmas. These were printed in Flanders, and were sent over to England as opportunity served, much to the annoyance of the queen and the bishops whom she had appointed. In 1563 an act was passed to restrain 'the licentious boldness' of those who of late had presumed to maintain the authority of the bishop of Rome; and the doing so by word or writing was to incur the penalties of præmunire; a repetition of the offence was to be visited by forfeiture and death, as in cases of high treason. It was the puritan parliament that had tried to force the queen's hand by passing this law; but Elizabeth had no intention of pressing it, and in fact it remained almost a dead letter for some years. But as time went on the catholic exiles began to feel that they were getting less and less in touch with the great mass of the catholics at home, and that as the old priests of Queen Mary's days, who had been schooled in the old faith and ritual, died off, the rising generation would gradually become habituated to the new worship and acquiesce in the new theology. It seemed to them of vital importance that England should be supplied with catholic priests who should fill the places of those who died off, and if possible that their numbers should be increased. In 1561 Philip II had founded a university at Douay in Artois, the original object being to discourage young men in the Netherlands from seeking education in France by providing them with as good education at home. The first chancellor was Dr. Richard Smith, a former fellow of Merton and regius professor of divinity at Oxford, one of the refugees. The appointment was significant. But much more significant was the foundation of the English college in the university by William Allen, subsequently known as Cardinal Allen, fellow of Oriel [see Allen, William]. The avowed object of this foundation was to educate young Englishmen for the priesthood, who should be pledged to return to

England, there to pursue their ministrations and act as 'missioners' among the neglected catholics. The progress of the college was rapid enough to prove that it had been wanted. In 1574 the first of the newly ordained priests started upon the English mission, and from that time, year by year, great detachments were sent over, till in 1577 there were as many as twenty-four priests ordained, and next year twenty-two more. Meanwhile the pope's bull of excommunication had been published in 1570, and the parliament had expressed its alarm. In 1571 the famous act was passed which made it an offence punishable with death and forfeiture for any catholic priest to give absolution and 'reconcile' any one to the church of Rome, or for any one to receive such absolution at his hands. So far from this act tending to deter young enthusiasts from entering upon the perilous mission, it is plain that there was a certain fascination for many in the very danger to be faced and the hardships to be endured. In 1576 the feeling against the English in the Netherlands became very bitter. A strong party, by no means exclusively Calvinists, felt keenly that Elizabeth had betrayed them or was ready to betray them to Philip, and at Douay there was a cry raised that the English college was a nest of traitors who were playing false to the cause of the United Provinces. They were Englishmen, they should be expelled from the town. At this time there were no fewer than 120 students in the college. The worldly-wise among the townsmen saw that such an institution must needs be a source of income to the place; for a while they managed to keep down the violence of the multitude, but when the landing of Sir John Norris with the force sent by Elizabeth on 7 Jan. 1578 was followed by the disastrous defeat of Gembloux on the 31st, and the dastardly slaughter of six hundred prisoners in cold blood, the grief and rage of the people of Douay burst forth afresh. Elizabeth, they thought, had betrayed them, and Englishmen were all traitors, whatever their creed. The college was compelled to break up. In August it reassembled at Rheims, though with diminished numbers. Henceforth for a while its home was in the dominions of the king of France, not in those of the king of Spain. The stream of missioners continued to flow steadily across the Channel. Thirteen landed in England in 1578, next year twenty-one crossed over, twenty-nine more in 1580, exclusive of the two jesuit fathers, Parsons and Campion. It was not in the nature of things that such an immigration of proselytisers should not be followed by a revival of catholic sentiment in the country, or that the hopes of the ardent and sanguine among the catholic party should not rise. It is evident that there was a decided catholic revival, and that the comparative leniency shown to the catholic gentry tended to embolden those who had an affection for the old ritual. It was not long before they were awakened to a sense of their danger. A regular system of espionage was begun; the houses of the catholics were watched, and on Palm Sunday 1574 (4 April) a raid was made simultaneously upon three important houses in London, and Lady Morley, Lady Guilford, and Lady Brown, 'with divers other gentlewomen,' were surprised as they were hearing mass, and together with four priests were apprehended to be dealt with 'according to the statute in that case provided.' The four priests appear to have been old 'Queen Mary priests,' not missioners from the seminaries abroad. It was a beginning, but only a beginning.

The spies caught the first seminarist, Cuthbert Mayne, in the autumn of 1577. He was hanged and mangled on 29 Nov., and his host, Francis Tregean, a Cornish gentleman with a good estate, was thrown into prison, where he was kept for twenty-eight years, and sent out of the country to die in exile. In the following February two more of the missioners were taken and hanged at Tyburn, and from this time till the end of the reign the barbarities never ceased. But it was when Parsons and Campion, the first two jesuits who had ever set foot in England, landed in June 1580, that the queen, or at any rate her council, began to be seriously alarmed. There was no question of sedition, no thought of a rebellion, but there was a very great question as to who was to be obeyed in England in religious matters, the pope or the queen. The priests ordained abroad, and persisting in saying mass at home, were guilty of high treason according to the act. They defied the act, and must take the consequences of their temerity. This view of the case narrowed the issue to limits beyond which Elizabeth refused to look. One and all these priestly fanatics professed to honour her as their queen, and confessed that in conscience they were bound to obey her, with one reservation, however—they could not acknowledge her authority as supreme head of the church in things spiritual. Elizabeth would have all or none; the obedience she claimed admitted of no reserve. Liberty of conscience, freedom of worship, she could no more away with than could Philip II or Alva. No special pleading in the world, no attempt to extenuate the acts done on the ground that they were called for by the exigencies of the

hour, can alter the fact that for at least twenty years of Elizabeth's reign torture of the most revolting kind was habitually employed upon wretched men and women, who one after another declared that they prayed for her as their queen, but they could not, they dared not, accept the creed she attempted to impose upon them. During all these years there is no sign that Elizabeth ever felt one throb of pity or ever hesitated to sign a warrant for execution or to deliver over a miserable wretch to be dealt with by the 'rack master.' Campion was brought into her presence for a private interview from a dark and loathsome dungeon; the very next day he was subjected to inhuman torture. Fifteen years later the monster Topcliffe wrote a long letter to the queen setting forth his claim upon her regard, the ground of that claim being that he had helped more catholics to execution than any man in England. The justice of that claim was allowed, and for some years longer he continued at the old trade of vivisection and butchery.

Exactly a month after the death of Alençon William of Orange fell by the hand of an assassin (10 July 1584). In the Netherlands Parma made steady way against the insurgents, and the Dutch provinces seemed to be on the verge of despair. In July 1585 deputies from the States came to England, throwing themselves upon Elizabeth, prepared to make any conditions she might impose as the price of her help. The conditions were very hard ones. The queen was to furnish and pay four thousand men. Flushing, Brill, Ostend, and Rammekins, all coast towns, were to be delivered into her hands till the expenses which the war might cost should be repaid. As usual, the army arrived too late to save Antwerp, and was sent off without stores or a responsible commander. No sooner had the troops gone than Elizabeth wished they had never started, and Leicester was not allowed to leave England to commence operations till more than two months had elapsed. It may be true that he was incompetent; but hampered and thwarted as he was at every turn success was impossible. It may be true that his acceptance of the dignity of governor-general of the provinces (24 Jan. 1586) was an act of revolt against Elizabeth's authority; but her despatching a special envoy to flout him publicly before the States was an outrage without excuse, without precedent. There could be but one end to a campaign under such a commander, left without moral or material support from the queen at home. Leicester returned to England in September. The soldiers were left without pay, they were disbanded by their officers, and returned next year literally in rags and begging their bread, a miserable remnant of the host that had gone forth with hopes of conquest two years before.

The presence of Mary Stuart in England had from the first been embarrassing to Elizabeth. During the first five years of her captivity the Queen of Scots had been a source of unceasing disquiet. She had given no rest to her friends in Scotland and France, she had written to the pope imploring and claiming his intervention, she had laid plans for her escape, she had engaged in, or been believed to be at the bottom of, every treasonable plot; Elizabeth suspected that her coolest statesmen would succumb to her fascinations; but with the death of the Earl of Mar and the storming of Edinburgh Castle all hope of her ever being able to keep a party together in Scotland was at an end. Mary continued to live in somewhat luxurious captivity under the care of Lord Shrewsbury; but she could not live without intriguing, she had nothing else to do. It was by her means that a secret marriage was arranged in 1574 between Lord Charles Stuart, Darnley's brother, and Elizabeth Cavendish, Lady Shrewsbury's daughter by her first husband; the issue of that marriage was the Lady Arabella Stuart [see ARABELLA]. In 1576 the news came that Bothwell had died at Copenhagen—it was uncertain whether in prison or in a madhouse. Then came the trial of Morton, his confession that he had been cognisant of the murder of Darnley and privy to Bothwell's carrying off the queen; and his death upon the scaffold (2 June 1581). Close upon this followed the plot of Parsons and Creighton, the jesuits, the raid of Ruthven, and the wild project of the Duke of Guise for an invasion of the south, while James was to lead an army from the north, and a general rising was to be organised of Mary's supporters in England. Meanwhile the persecution of the wretched catholics waxed hot and increased in cruelty. They who were moved with pity for the sufferers passed from pity to sympathy; there was a growing party of enthusiasts prepared to make sacrifices for the beautiful captive. Her long captivity was spoken of among those who knew little about the facts as a martyrdom for the true faith, her stubborn constancy was declared to be christian heroism. At last the great Guise conspiracy—a stupid vague piece of vapouring talk about what might be—became public property. Francis Throckmorton, after enduring the horrible tortures of the rack twice without betraying his friends, broke down at the sight of the

dreaded instrument the third time, and told all he knew. There was serious alarm, for the Earls of Arundel and Northumberland (Henry Percy) were deeply implicated and were thrown into the Tower. A fresh batch of seminary priests were slaughtered. The Spanish ambassador left England in fierce wrath. Diplomatic relations between England and Spain were suspended, and it was soon found that De Guaras, who remained as a kind of Spanish consul to whom the merchants might refer in commercial disputes or questions of difficulty, was carrying on intrigues with the Queen of Scots, and, after being thrown into prison, was sent out of the country and told he might never come back. It was plain that a war with Spain must come sooner or later, and such a war could not but be looked forward to with anxiety. In October 1584 Walsingham and Burghley between them bethought them of a new and special appeal to the loyalty of the country. An 'Instrument of an Association for the preservation of the Queen's Majesty's Royal person' was drawn up with great care and circulated not only among the clergy and nobility, but among freeholders, farmers, and all men of substance in the several counties of England and Wales. It was in fact the first time in our history that anything approaching a *plébiscite* had been attempted which should express a decided vote of confidence in the sovereign. As a matter of course the instrument was signed without demur. The signatories bound themselves under an oath to preserve the queen's person with their substance and their lives, and to 'pursue to utter extermination' all who should attempt to harm her 'or claim succession to the crown by the untimely death of her majesty' (*Cal.* Dom. 1584, p. 210).

There could be no doubt who was aimed at in the clause which mentioned those who should 'claim succession to the crown.' Walsingham took care that the document should be shown to Mary Stuart. She was equal to the occasion, and at once declared her willingness to add her own signature.

The parliament met again on 23 Nov., voted liberal supplies in view of what was felt to be impending, and passed an act which in fact embodied the provisions of the instrument of association and made any person in whose favour an attempt at rebellion or taking the queen's life should be made, personally responsible for the consequences that might ensue, and the issue of such person cut off from succession to the crown. Having passed this act the parliament was again prorogued on 29 March 1585. An incident of a very startling nature had, however, disturbed the equanimity of the members before the parliament was a month old. There was a certain William Parry, a doctor of civil law of some foreign university, who had been returned as member for Queenborough, probably through the interest of Lord Burghley, who had employed Parry in some dubious missions for several years past. He was a man of blasted character, and it is difficult to believe that he was quite sane. A bill had been brought in for increasing the severity with which the seminary priests were to be dealt with, and for recalling, under tremendous penalties, the children of all the catholic gentry who were being educated abroad. When the bill was brought in for the third reading, Parry opposed it in a speech of extraordinary boldness and violence. The house was for the moment electrified, but Parry was given into custody, and his committal was expected to follow. To the surprise of every one the queen ordered his release, and no further notice was taken of his conduct. Six weeks later he was sent to the Tower on a charge of high treason and attempting to compass the death of the queen. He was brought to trial on 25 Feb., pleaded guilty, and was hanged, drawn, and quartered five days later. Whether he was as wicked as was believed, a mere impostor, or a madman or a dupe, it is certain that Parry had been going about for years sounding this man and that among the catholic divines on the question of the lawfulness of assassinating Elizabeth; and though he had entirely failed to obtain any sanction for his intended or pretended crime, and though he was eventually caught in his own trap, yet he succeeded thus far,—that the names of such men as Parsons the jesuit, Cardinal Allen, and even the pope had been mentioned as in some way connected with Parry's doings, and the temper of men's minds was not softened towards Mary Stuart, who was credited with being at the bottom of every new discovery of real or supposed treasons. While the parliament was sitting and deliberating upon an act which really sealed her fate, Mary was transferred from the custody of Lord Shrewsbury to another keeper, and on 20 April she was committed to the custody of Sir Amyas Paulet, a grim and sour puritan, and found herself a close prisoner at Tutbury, rigorously watched day and night, and shut off from all communion with her friends outside. She saw hope passing from her, fretted, chafed, grew desperate, but all in vain. Her son made his own bargain with the queen of England and left his mother to her fate. The confinement at Tutbury told upon her temper and her spirit;

she begged vehemently to be removed elsewhere. In January 1586 Elizabeth transferred her to Chartley in Staffordshire, a house of the Earl of Essex, where she remained till the following September. During these eventful months the vigilant supervision over Mary was relaxed, and as a matter of course intrigue and conspiracy began again and worse than ever.

The Babington plot was initiated [see BABINGTON, ANTHONY; BALLARD, JOHN]. By the instrumentality of Gilbert Gifford (whom Mr. Froude strangely asserts to have been trained by the jesuits, which he certainly was not), Walsingham became as well acquainted with the movements of the plotters as they were themselves; he chose his own time for apprehending them, and was so deliberate in his plan of operations that the whole plot was believed by some to have been concocted by himself (see a letter in *Cal. State Papers*, Dom., Addenda, 1580–1625, p. 223), and is so represented even by Lingard. Gifford was allowed to slip away into France, where he died as a prisoner in the Bastille in 1590 (*Walpole Letters*, x. *n.* 2). The rest, fifteen in number, were put to death with such inhuman barbarities that even in those days the populace were shocked and indignant. There is too much reason to believe that Elizabeth herself suggested this exceptionally horrible treatment of the wretched criminals in one of her outbursts of ferocity.

The wretched men who had taken part in the Babington plot were brought to trial on 13 Sept. On 6 Oct. a commission was issued for the trial of the Queen of Scots. The commissioners assembled at Fotheringay, whither Mary had been removed (on 25 Sept.); the actual trial began on 15 Oct. Mary Stuart was tried upon the late statute, the charge being that she had conspired to procure the invasion of the realm and the death of the queen. Elizabeth had strictly enjoined that on this occasion no sentence should be passed, and though the trial was virtually at an end the court adjourned to meet again in the Star-chamber at Westminster on 25 Oct. On that day the commissioners reassembled and pronounced sentence of death. Parliament assembled on the 29th, and the proceedings in the trial were laid before each house. On 12 Nov. both houses united in a petition to the queen that the sentence should be carried out without delay. Elizabeth returned an ambiguous answer; she could not take the decided step; she hesitated and delayed from week to week; she wished the Queen of Scots were dead with all her heart; she shrank from the shame and disgrace that would attach to her if she brought her to the block. The lords of the council, with Burghley at their head, were unanimous in pressing for the execution. Leicester, away in Holland, wrote letters urging her to it. It must be conceded that Elizabeth stood alone at this dreadful time in feeling any reluctance to carry out the sentence. She knew that the whole responsibility of the act would rest with her if it were carried out, and she tried desperately to shift that responsibility from her own shoulders. There is no trace of any softening towards the Queen of Scots, only a feverish desire to set herself right with the world outside her own kingdom, exactly as her father had for years shrunk from divorcing himself from Catherine of Arragon. When Elizabeth saw that she must either cease to look for the approval of the civilised world or leave undone the deed which she had resolved to do, she sent Mary Stuart to the scaffold and repented, not that the deed was done, but that she had been the doer of it. By far the most dreadful reproach that posterity has to bring upon her is, and must for ever remain the fact, that a week before the execution Elizabeth made one last attempt to induce Sir Amyas Paulet and Sir Drue Drury to kill Mary Stuart privately. Paulet, 'with great grief and bitterness of mind,' made answer to the detestable proposal: 'God forbid,' he wrote, 'that I should make so foul a shipwreck of my conscience or leave so great a blot to my poor posterity, to shed blood without law or warrant' (SIR A. PAULET, *Letter Book*, p. 362). When the tidings came that the warrant Elizabeth had signed had indeed been executed, she overacted her part; her fury was real, but her repudiation of all share in the responsibility of the final tragedy could deceive none of those who to the very last she had vainly hoped might contrive somehow to save her from herself. Davison was the one victim whom she sacrificed to her resentment, the one statesman whom she could afford to degrade. Six days after the execution had become known to the world and had provoked one loud burst of horror and indignation over Europe, Elizabeth, in a letter to James (now by his mother's death undisputed king of Scotland), expresses 'extreme dolour' for the 'miserable accident' that had befallen, and Robert Carey, the bearer of that letter, believed she was sincere. There is little doubt she was. How could she but be grieved that the moral sense of the world condemned her?

While the arrangements for the removal of Mary Stuart from Tutbury to Chartley were being discussed by Sir Amyas Paulet and his correspondents, Sir Francis Drake set

sail from Plymouth (14 Sept. 1585) on his memorable voyage to Spain. The little fleet numbered twenty-five sail all told. It was not the last of those strange ventures in which the queen herself took shares, and which had as their object the committing ravages upon the dominions of Philip and enriching the shareholders. Drake returned 28 July 1586. The expedition hardly paid its expenses, but to Spain and her trade it brought heavy calamity. Meanwhile Elizabeth was dreaming of deserting the Netherlands. She was allowing her small army to waste away inactive and half starved, and actually making or listening to overtures for a peace with Spain on the basis of abandoning the cause of the provinces and surrendering, not to them but to their implacable foe, the cautionary towns that had been handed over to her as the price of her co-operation. While she was halting between two opinions, perplexing her ministers and herself, and trying to outwit every one by turns, Drake was allowed to slip away with a squadron of thirty sail, of which this time six large ships belonged to the queen's navy, with orders to 'impeach the joining together of the king of Spain's fleet,' and otherwise to do them all the harm he could. Drake got off on 2 April 1587. Exactly a week after he had sailed Elizabeth changed her mind, and sent him counter orders. They came too late; Drake was not the man to tarry. On the 19th he made a dash upon Cadiz, burnt and sank thirty-three vessels, and brought away four that were already laden with provisions for the forces that were to invade England, when the great expedition should be ready to start. There was no secret about it now. Philip II had made up his mind at last, and was grimly in earnest.

When Philip II embarked upon the ambitious enterprise of the conquest of England, he had been engaged for thirty years in a vain attempt at making himself absolute ruler of the Netherlands, and as far as the seven northern provinces were concerned he was no nearer than he had ever been to success. The cost of this protracted war had got beyond the power of calculation. Spain had become the poorest country in Europe, and her people the most heavily taxed people in the world. What is most surprising is the fact that Philip himself knew the desperate condition of his finances, and yet never for one moment swerved in his purpose, and never doubted his ability to invade and conquer England, and sweep her navies from the sea. As little did his infatuated subjects doubt the omnipotence of their sovereign. In the pride of his immeasurable self-reliance he was incapable of understanding that while he had been wrecking his finances in bootless warfare, the rest of the world had been benefiting by his blind expenditure. He knew nothing of England's real resources, nothing of that mighty reserve of power which the queen of England could always fall back upon.

A standing army was a thing unknown in England. But the musters constituted a militia ready at any moment to take the field fully armed; while the liability to furnish ships for the defence of the coast, assessed by no means exclusively upon the seaports and the counties most exposed to invasion, guaranteed to the nation at large that a national fleet could be provided at the expense of all in the hour of need, and by the simplest financial machinery. Of the whole number of ships, great and small, which sailed out to meet the Armada, not a third were even paid and victualled by the queen. More than 120 vessels were fitted out by the London merchants and the smaller seaports (Macpherson, *Annals of Commerce*, ii. 185; *Cal.* Dom. 1588, pp. 477, 482), and these were as a rule far better furnished than the queen's ships. The latter were notoriously and scandalously ill-furnished with stores and provisions for the sailors, and it is impossible to lay the blame upon any one but the queen. She would not believe that invasion was seriously intended; she shut her eyes to facts. At a time when it was of supreme importance that there should be no hesitation, no delay, no appearance of stint, there was everywhere niggardliness and trumpery higgling with contractors about the price of supplies. It was not so much that the commissariat broke down, as that there was no commissariat. The queen had gone on from day to day putting off the giving of those orders which involved the spending her money generously. So elaborate had been the arrangements for providing all needful supplies to the Armada, that the number of the victualling and store vessels accompanying the fighting ships proved a serious embarrassment. The queen's ships were without the barest necessaries.

Elizabeth stubbornly refused to open her eyes to the danger, even when the Spanish fleet had been sighted off the coast (*Cal.* Dom. 1588, p. 493). Lord Howard, writing to Walsingham in June, bitterly grieves that 'her majesty will not thoroughly awake . . . in this perilous time.' Here and there offers were sent up by generous volunteers to supply victuals for a month at their own cost (p. 494). Everywhere there was a burning impatience to act upon the offensive, and it was the

unanimous opinion of the most experienced commanders that Spain should be attacked on her own coast, not waited for on the narrow seas. Drake again and again urged this upon the queen and her council; they were only eager to follow his advice, but their hands were tied. Elizabeth meddled, delayed, hesitated. It really looked as if England could only be saved in spite of her. In the third week of July, when a Spanish fleet was reported off the Lizard, Lord Howard 'begs for the love of God' to have some powder and shot sent to him, and this while a running fire was being kept up actually within sight of Plymouth. There were but three weeks' supplies provided, and some of the ships engaged had provisions only for a few days. It was just as bad with the land forces. The army which had been called out specially for the defence of the queen's person had as yet had no commander appointed over it. The fortifications at Gravesend were said to be in a fair condition. Tilbury might be made impregnable, but there was neither powder nor guns, nor any other adequate supplies. On 26 July Leicester writes that four thousand men had assembled at West Tilbury, all animated by a spirit of enthusiastic loyalty, yet again 'great want of victuals; not a barrel of beer nor a loaf of bread after twenty miles march.' On the 27th Leicester took the command of the forces on the Thames. It was on 8 Aug. that Elizabeth arrived at the camp at Tilbury from St. James's, and rode along the lines, sowing the seed of brave and kindly words to the soldiers. But by this time the danger was past, and the Armada had disappeared. From the very first the Spanish ships had done little else than try to get away from their determined assailants. When it was all over one of the captains, writing to Walsingham, exclaims, in the bitterness of his disappointment, 'Her parsimony at home hath bereaved us of the famousest victory that ever our nation had at sea.' The gain to England had been astonishingly small; the loss of life among the starved and neglected sailors was frightful. On 10 Aug. Lord Howard declares to Burghley that 'the Elizabeth Jonas had lost half her crew,' and that 'of all the men brought out by Sir Ric. [Roger?] Townsend, *he has but one man* alive.' Well might the admiral say, 'It is a pitiful sight to see the men die in the streets of Margate.' But the victory was won and the country was safe, and on 20 Aug. Dean Nowell preached a sermon of thanksgiving at St. Paul's, the lord mayor and all the city magnates attending with the usual civic pomp. On 24 Nov. Elizabeth herself went to St. Paul's in state to give thanks for her deliverance (Nichols, *Progresses*, ii. 538). Little more than three weeks after her review of the troops at Tilbury Leicester died at Cornbury, Oxfordshire, on his way to Kenilworth (4 Sept.) No sooner was his death known than the queen seized upon his estate, and sold his effects by public auction in discharge of a debt he owed to the exchequer. It may be that her bitter hate of Leicester's widow furnishes us with some excuse or some explanation of this step.

The romance of Elizabeth's life ends with this year, 1588. She was now fifty-five. There could be no more talk of love and marriage. Death had played sad havoc with her old suitors; Eric of Sweden, Adolphus of Holstein, the Valois princes had all passed away, and now Leicester was dead. Yet if at times the conviction of her loneliness came upon her, or she was brought face to face with the fact that her youth had fled, she put these thoughts from her, and with a haughty vehemence she refused to look forward. If there was a finality about her position which her ministers were for ever trying to provide against, to the very end she declined to concern herself with what might come. Her successor she would never name. Yet the loss of Leicester, her 'sweet Robin,' must have come upon her as a real personal loss from time to time. She and he understood one another; he never presumed too far upon the intimate relations that existed between them.

The exchequer was empty; the cost of keeping up the forces by land and sea had been very heavy; the nation was ready to pay the bill of the past year, and ready too to incur a new one if Spain could be humbled, and danger from that quarter be effectually put a stop to. Parliament met on 4 Feb. 1589, and voted liberal supplies. The payment of the subsidies, tenths, and fifteenths was spread over four years, the people would feel the weight of the taxation very little, they were quite prepared to support the queen in a war of reprisal. Nevertheless Elizabeth would by no means consent to protract the conflict, or to carry it on as her father would have done. If her people entertained towards her person that passionate loyalty which almost rose to the point of blind worship, then it was for them to defend her at their own charges. Elizabeth seems never to have been able to take any other than this narrow view. When the great expedition of Norris and Drake set sail in April 1589, it assumed the character of a mere joint-stock speculation, a huge piratical venture, to which the queen contributed 20,000*l.* and six ships (*Cal.* Dom. Addl. 1580–1603, p. 273). A flimsy excuse was offered for it which could deceive no one. Don Antonio, the claimant

to the throne of Portugal, it was said, was asserting no more than his right, and this fleet of 160 sail (*ib.* p. 275), and carrying a force of more than twenty-three thousand men, was equipped with the object of supporting him in his attempt to recover his kingdom. The Portuguese pretender gained nothing, the adventurers lost heavily, the whole thing was a humiliating disappointment, except in the damage it wrought to Spain. The loss of life was again 'appalling' [see DRAKE, SIR FRANCIS]. Six years later Elizabeth sent out her last and most disastrous expedition to the West Indies and the Spanish main. Drake and Hawkins were associated in the command of the fleet. Neither of them returned. Hawkins died on 11 Nov. 1595 as his ship lay at anchor off Porto Rico; Drake on 28 Jan. following at Porto Bello. Frobisher had died in November 1594. There were none to take their places.

After this time there was no more sending fleets across the Atlantic. It was shrewdly suspected that the king of Spain might be attacked and his treasure-ships intercepted just as easily and much more economically on the coast of Spain and Portugal as four thousand miles away. Drake's last voyage was followed up by the famous Cadiz voyage in 1596 [see DEVEREUX, ROBERT, second EARL OF ESSEX], which brought more glory than profit, and by the Island voyage of 1597, which brought neither profit nor glory. Elizabeth was irritated by the intelligence that the treasure fleet had escaped her navies three years running, and that no gain had come to her exchequer to repay the advances she had made. The last of the naval expeditions was that of 1602. Sir Richard Leveson with Sir William Monson as his vice-admiral was sent off with a fleet of ten ships (*Cal.* Dom. 1602, p. 152), victualled for five months to cruise off the coast of Spain, do all the damage it could, and intercept any vessels returning from the East or West Indian voyage. He fell in with a carrack of fourteen hundred tons, drove her into Lisbon, and managed to cut her out under the guns of the fort and bring her safely into Plymouth in July (*ib.* p. 228). She proved a valuable prize, laden with ebony, spices, and other produce, but treasure there was none. The Portugal trade was with the East Indies. The fleet laden with the produce of the silver mines of Bolivia was always bound for San Lucar. It was a poor return for all the cost, but it was something. With this success the naval history of Elizabeth's reign comes to an end.

We have seen that for the first thirty years of her reign Elizabeth had managed to keep from any very costly interference with the interminable civil wars that were going on in France. The time came at last when she could no longer hold aloof from the fierce struggle. A rapid succession of ghastly surprises, such as only French history can furnish examples of, beginning at the end of the Armada year, brought on a crisis. The murder of the two Guises in December 1588, the death of Catherine de' Medici a fortnight later, and the assassination of Henry III on 1 Aug. 1589, had opened the question who was to succeed to the throne now that the house of Valois had come to an end. Elizabeth was compelled to support the cause of Henry of Navarre, if only to thwart the ambitious designs of Philip. In September 1590 Lord Willoughby de Eresby was sent across the Channel with four thousand men and some supplies of money [see BERTIE, PEREGRINE]. But he returned without effecting anything. Next year Henry IV won the famous battle of Ivry (14 March), but lost more than he gained when the Spaniards under Parma succeeded in relieving Paris. In 1591 he was driven to apply to Elizabeth again, and Robert, earl of Essex, was sent out with four thousand men on 21 July [see DEVEREUX, ROBERT, second EARL OF ESSEX]. Henceforth the part that England played in French affairs was inconsiderable. The dreaded Parma died on 2 Dec. 1592, and when Henry IV apostatised and was received into the church of Rome (23 July 1593) Elizabeth took less interest in French affairs. France and Spain made peace at Vervins (2 May 1598); the edict of Nantes was published three weeks later, and Philip himself died in the following September. The treaty with the Netherlands of August 1598 relieved Elizabeth from all expense in the war that was going on, and put her in the anomalous position of a sovereign pledged to permit the levying of forces in her own kingdom which were to be used abroad (*Fœdera*, xvi. 340). So, only that her own exchequer was not burdened, her subjects might fight the Spaniards on the other side of the Channel at the cost of the States, leaving her to make peace with Spain if the time should come for that.

The administration of Ireland during the reign of the queen is not a pleasant subject to write upon. So far as the queen had any Irish policy it resolved itself into one fixed idea, to which she clung with more than her usual stubborn tenacity of purpose. Ireland was to be assimilated in all respects to England, in law and in religion; and she must be made to pay her own expenses, and, if it might be so, to contribute to the national ex-

chequer. Deputy after deputy was sent over, only to return more or less disgraced and impoverished. The ancient Brehon law was done away with, the ancient religion remained. The story of treachery, bloodshed, wholesale massacres, and ferocity on one side or the other is hideously monotonous. The one single monument of Elizabeth's rule in Ireland which reflects any honour upon her memory is the university of Dublin, which opened its doors in 1593 and admitted the great Ussher, then a boy of thirteen, among its first undergraduates. It was in this very year that the rebellion of Tyrone broke out. For five weary years Ireland was ravaged and plundered by one side and the other with the usual barbarities. On 14 Aug. 1598 things came to a crisis. Tyrone had laid siege to Blackwatertown, a stronghold of some importance, well garrisoned and stubbornly defended, situated about five miles from Armagh. Sir Henry Bagnell, marshal of the queen's army in Ireland, hurried to the relief of the fort with nearly four thousand men. Tyrone turned upon him and utterly defeated the English host. Bagnell himself, a large number of his officers, and more than seven hundred of his men were slain. The completeness and the disgrace of the defeat produced a profound impression (CHAMBERLAIN, *Letters*, Camden Soc. 1861). Lord Burghley died just ten days before this disaster.

Of all the stories that have been told of Queen Elizabeth none are more honourable to her memory than those which speak of her kind and gentle treatment of Lord Burghley during his last illness. When her faithful treasurer, to whom she owed so much during his lifelong service, lay dying, the queen visited him again and again. In him she lost the firm supporter on whom she knew she could rely without misgiving, the wise counsellor who was never at fault, the faithful minister whose loyalty was his religion. 'Serve God by serving the queen' were almost the last words he wrote to his son, Sir Robert Cecil, three weeks before he died.

All the old advisers of the queen had died off now. Leicester, Walsingham, Hatton, and now the great Cecil, had all passed away; a very different band had gathered round her. There was no more the old severity and caution and largeness of view, nor was there the old unquestioning submission to her will. The new men were squabbling among themselves for the first place, in the hope that they might acquire ascendency over her, not with the simple desire to serve her loyally. Young Sir Robert Cecil, now about twenty-five years old, was the only man who had inherited the traditions of the old days. Raleigh and Essex were both brilliant, passionate, jealous of each other, with a certain martial ardour and restlessness which they had in common, and a certain craving for adventure, which was the outcome of their romantic temperament.

When Lord Burghley died, Robert, earl of Essex, had been ten years at court. He was in his thirty-first year, and had received from the queen many and signal proofs of her favour. But his arrogance was unbounded, and, though Elizabeth entertained for him a strong feeling of personal interest amounting to affection, he presumed so outrageously upon her indulgence that it is wonderful she bore with him so long. In 1593, at the suggestion of Francis Bacon, Essex threw himself with characteristic energy into the study of foreign affairs, and employed a large staff of 'intelligencers' to furnish him with reports from all parts of Europe. In 1594 he believed that he had discovered a plot against the queen's life. Dr. Lopez, the queen's physician, was accused of having accepted a bribe to poison her. Burghley and Sir Robert Cecil put no faith in it; Elizabeth herself laughed at it; but Essex vehemently persisted in his accusation of the unhappy man, and he was executed on evidence which was shamefully insufficient. Then came the Cadiz and the Island voyages. On his return from the latter Essex found that he had lost ground at court. He became more and more petulant and unmannerly, and a few weeks before Burghley's death he was so unbearably insolent to the queen that she gave him a violent box on the ear. Essex put his hand upon his sword-hilt. It was wellnigh the most dramatic incident in Elizabeth's life.

Raleigh was in disgrace, Essex was irrepressible. Whether he wished it or not may admit of doubt, but in March 1599 Essex was appointed 'lieutenant and governor-general of Ireland' (DEVEREUX, ii. 11). He failed signally. The queen wrote angrily, and on 30 July peremptorily forbade his leaving his post. In September he agreed to a truce with Tyrone. Elizabeth was very indignant, and warned him against coming to any terms with the Irish without her sanction being obtained beforehand. Essex forthwith left Dublin, and on 28 Sept. arrived in London, directly contrary to orders. The flagrant disobedience of orders was utterly indefensible, and a less severe sentence than was passed could hardly have been pronounced. Essex was dismissed from all offices of state, and ordered to remain a prisoner in his own house at the queen's pleasure; this was on 5 June 1600. Immediately after Essex had appeared

in England, he was superseded in his government of Ireland by Charles Blount, eighth lord Mountjoy [q. v.], who succeeded brilliantly where Essex had failed deplorably. Elizabeth lived to hear that the Irish rebellion had been brought to an end, but the formal submission of Tyrone came too late—it was made not to her, but to her successor.

The glory of Elizabeth's reign began to wane with the scattering of the Armada. She had won a position in European politics which none could venture to disregard. At home things were not what they had been. There was far less splendour in her court, its tone was lowered. A certain air of dulness, even of vulgarity, slowly crept over the very pageants and masques and festivities which were presented as homage to her majesty from year to year. Even Spenser's genius could not rise above affectation in addressing her in 1590, and when next year the lake at Cowdray was dragged, and the net emptied at her feet with a very prosaic oration, foolery could hardly go lower. The queen visited Oxford for the second time in 1592; the proceedings were drearily dull, there was no enthusiasm, no gaiety. Very different were the drolleries which were exhibited before her by the gentlemen of Gray's Inn in 1594; then the fun was of the broadest, the jokes and language lavishly coarse, even to grossness. Nevertheless these fantastic entertainments were kept up to the very last. Against the advice of her council she persisted in paying her accustomed visits to the houses of the nobility in the winter of 1602, and it was probably the pitiless north-east wind which prevailed in January 1603, and to which she exposed herself with her usual imprudence, that brought on her last illness. Of all that remarkable band of men who served her so loyally in the times of trial and danger, Thomas Sackville, lord Buckhurst, alone survived her. Ambrose Dudley, earl of Warwick, Leicester's elder brother, and Sir Francis Walsingham died in 1590, Sir Christopher Hatton in 1591, the rugged old Lord Hunsdon and his brother-in-law, Sir Francis Knollys [q.v.], in 1596. Elizabeth made immense demands upon her ministers. It may be doubted whether any of those who enjoyed her greatest favour (with the single exception of Leicester) were at all the richer for their devotion to her person. Walsingham and Hatton died insolvent, Burghley's patrimony was very little increased by all his preferments, and the rivalries in the splendour of the entertainment offered crippled more than one of the wealthiest of the nobility. All this prodigal display was slowly but surely tending to weaken the aristocracy. The wealth of the merchants was rapidly growing, the moneyed class was steadily gaining power. Elizabeth saw what was coming, but she did not love the commons; she was always averse to summon a parliament, and never did so until she was compelled.

Parliament, indeed, was called together only thirteen times in more than forty-four years. During the last thirteen years of her reign it assembled thrice, viz. in 1592, 1597, and 1601. When the house had voted supplies, the sooner it was dissolved the better. It is evident that Elizabeth was in some anxiety as to how the parliament of 1592–1593 would behave, and when the lord-keeper, Puckering, delivered his opening address, he expressly warned the members that they were not expected to make new laws, for there were enough of them already, but to provide for the present necessities. When there arose a discussion upon the question whether all recusants, whatever their creed, should be treated alike, and a stormy religious debate seemed imminent, the queen promptly interposed. Thereupon, as if to console themselves for being silenced where they would have preferred to speak, or to show their dissatisfaction, the members argued this time on the subject of the triple subsidy and the tenths and fifteenths that were asked for. Sir Robert Cecil declared that the last subsidies of 1589 had only yielded 280,000*l.*, against which the queen had spent from her own exchequer 1,030,000*l.* in defensive wars (D'Ewes, p. 483); but the house was either in no good humour or was badly handled, and the vote was only agreed to, and the bill passed after a debate which extended over the unprecedented time of eleven days (*ib.* p. 507). Five years later parliament voted supplies upon the same scale without demur, but during the session an address to the queen was drawn up, protesting against 'the enormous abuse of monopolies.' Just before the dissolution Elizabeth replied through Lord-keeper Egerton with an appeal to 'her loving and dutiful subjects' not to encroach on her prerogative. We are left to infer that the money vote of 1597 was granted, in part at least, 'for the speedy payment of the queen's majesty's debts. In the last parliament some difficulty was experienced. The ground taken by Cecil in 1601 for asking for fresh subsidies was that the Spaniards had landed a force in Ireland. If they are attacked at once, said the practical secretary, it will cost us 100,000*l.*; if we allow them to be reinforced, it will cost us half a million. So the money was voted. But the question of monopolies again came to the front, and it was proposed, in view of the

evasive reply given to the address of 1597, to deal with the question by statute. Cecil and Bacon in behalf of the queen strongly deprecated this course, but after four days' hot debate Elizabeth sent down a message announcing her intention to revoke all grants of monopolies 'that should be found injurious by fair trial at law' (Hallam). This prudent step satisfied the commons, and a collision between them and their sovereign was averted. Having got through a prodigious amount of business of a very miscellaneous character, the commons were sent for on 19 Dec. 1601 to the upper house, and there 'her majesty, under a rich cloth of state,' after receiving their obeisance, dissolved her last parliament, which had dealt more liberally with her than any that had gone before.

The harsh and cruel treatment which the seminary priests and all who favoured them received at the hands of Elizabeth has been already dwelt on. Between 24 July and 29 Nov. 1588 (four months!) twenty-two priests and eleven lay folk, one a woman, were put to death with revolting cruelties under the statute of 27 Eliz. (Tierney, *Dodd*, iii. 163). Though no such wholesale slaughter was perpetrated after this, yet not a year passed without some unhappy creatures being executed, even to within five weeks of the queen's death, when William Richardson, a seminary priest, was 'hanged, bowelled, and quartered' at Tyburn for being found in England contrary to the statute. But in the Armada year the puritans and sectaries began to find out that they too might presume too much upon the toleration which, such as it was, had been hitherto accorded to them. It is one of the many anomalies which we meet with in the history of Elizabeth's reign that, while ample freedom of worship was granted to foreigners, and churches were actually delivered over to them for their use (Moen, *Walloon Church of Norwich*, vol. i. pt. ii. chap. iii.), nonconformity, with the ritual prescribed by law, was punished as a crime when Englishmen were convicted of it. At first the only people who suffered inconvenience for conscience sake among the precisians were the clergy who objected to surplices and square caps, and the cross at baptism, and the ring at the marriage ceremony, with other matters equally trivial. These clergy were deprived of their livings, or suspended, or refused a license to preach in the churches; it is certain, however, that they were not otherwise worried. This only must be understood, that in the church the queen would tolerate no departure from the ritual established by law. Here and there it would happen that the friends of a popular preacher would gather together in private and so a 'conventicle' would be the result, but as no great harm was likely to come of such gatherings the authorities were not very ready to interfere. Separation from church communion had hardly been thought of as yet in England.

It was in 1567 that the first serious interference with a puritan conventicle was heard of. A large number of people had assembled at Plumbers' Hall in London, and while they were engaged in their religious exercises the myrmidons of the law burst in upon them and carried off a dozen or so of the boldest and threw them into prison (Strype, *Parker*, i. 480). This was not a solitary instance, for a year or two after this it appears that there were then many languishing in the London prisons, and that some had actually died in gaol (Mrs. Green, Preface, p. xlv, *Cal.* Dom. Add., 1566–79). As time went on the queen became less and less tolerant of any departure from the prescribed formularies; the puritans began to discover that the statute of 23 Eliz. c. 2 was a double-edged weapon, which might be used against themselves. It was on the charge of publishing seditious libels against the queen's government, which this statute had made a capital offence, that Penry, Udal, Barrow, and Greenwood suffered, though the first two were representatives of those who desired what they considered necessary ecclesiastical reforms; the others protested that the church of England as by law established was essentially corrupt in its constitution, and nothing short of separation from communion with it was imperative upon all true and faithful christians.

In dealing with the two classes of nonconformists, the Romanists and the puritans, the queen's method of procedure was marked by a notable difference. The Romanists refused to take the oath of supremacy, and refused to conform to the ritual by law established, on the ground that in spiritual matters they owed allegiance to the pope of Rome, at whose dictation they withdrew from all communion with the schismatical church of England and its excommunicated 'supreme head;' that is, they set up the authority of a foreign power as antagonistic to the power of the queen of England. This position, in the view which Elizabeth and her council thought proper to take of it, compelled the government to treat the nonconformity of the Romanists as a political offence, and as such it was dealt with by the civil power (see a remarkable speech of the queen reported in *Cal.* Dom. 1601–3, p. 168).

The puritans, on the other hand, railed

against the established religion and the ceremonies insisted on, because by their enactment burdens had been laid upon men's consciences which were more than they could bear. These men set up a court of appeal which they vaguely maintained was to be found in the Bible, and when it was answered that the Bible had been appealed to already, and the interpretation of the Bible had been expressed once for all in the formularies of the church of England, they rejected that interpretation as contradicting certain conclusions at which they had themselves arrived. The puritans thereupon were handed over to the bishops and ecclesiastical courts, and Elizabeth, as far as might be, left the disputants to settle their differences as best they could. The result was that from the catholics the bitter cry arose and continued against the queen and her council, the pursuivants, the judges, and the magistrates. From the puritans came louder and louder clamour against the bishops and the high commission court, and those ecclesiastical functionaries who from time to time worried and imprisoned offenders, silenced ministers, scattered conventicles, threw some zealots into prison, and, in some few instances—they were very few—sent obstinate and violent offenders to the scaffold. Personally, however, Elizabeth, though she hated the puritans and sectaries, took care to throw upon the church courts the odium of dealing with them. There were the formularies established by law, there was the old machinery of the church courts to put into force on occasion, there were the Thirty-nine Articles agreed on in convocation, and confirmed by act of parliament. Further than these the queen would not go. To her mind the question was settled; it should never be opened again. When the religious meetings termed 'prophesyings,' which many of the bishops in their several dioceses had encouraged with good results (Strype, *Annales*, II. i. 133, 472), began to assume the form of mere noisy and mischievous debates, in which the formularies were as often assailed as defended, Elizabeth put a stop to them with a high hand, notwithstanding Archbishop Grindal's expostulation (Strype, *Grindal*, p. 558).

And here it is necessary to remark upon the general attitude of Elizabeth towards the bishops of the church during her reign. The ecclesiastical organisation in England as it existed when Queen Mary died was very anomalous. Before the rupture with the papacy the church in theory was coordinate with the state. As the king was the head of the one, so the pope was the head of the other. By the reconciliation with Rome, which had been brought about in Queen Mary's time, this condition of affairs had been restored; but when Elizabeth succeeded she treated the reconciliation as if it had never taken effect. Thereupon she found herself face to face with the question, 'Who is now the head of the church in England?' It was a question that could not remain unanswered, and it was not long before she found herself compelled to accept the answer which her father had invented, and compelled to adopt the title which he had claimed of supreme head of the church in England. But she never cordially approved of the style. She never willingly interfered in matters ecclesiastical, and she inclined to leave the bishops with a free hand. When Grindal in 1577 refused to put down the prophesyings, he was suspended; but the suspension proved to be extremely inconvenient, and, after having been practically relaxed, it was at last taken off. The archbishop, however, became blind, and thereupon the queen requested him to resign the archbishopric. This he was willing enough to do, but some formal difficulties came in the way, and before the final arrangements could be effected Grindal died. A close parallel to this treatment of the archbishop is afforded in the case of Bishop Cox of Ely. He, too, incurred the queen's displeasure by his obstinate resistance to Sir Christopher Hatton and Roger, lord North, who had set themselves to rob the see of Ely of two of its episcopal houses. But Cox [see Cox, Richard] managed to hold his own after a fashion, though the courtiers made his life a burden to him. He, too, earnestly and repeatedly expressed his willingness to resign his see, but again difficulties came in the way, and he retained his bishopric till his death.

The letter so frequently quoted, professing to be from Queen Elizabeth to Bishop Cox, beginning with the words 'Proud prelate!' is a stupid and impudent forgery, which first saw the light in the 'Annual Register' of 1761. Yet, absurd as the fabrication is, few forgeries have succeeded so well in exercising a malignant influence upon the estimation in which the queen's character has been held by historians.

But if the authority and jurisdiction of the bishops was respected, it was far otherwise with their estates. There Elizabeth's love of money came in to help in shaping her course of action. When a bishopric was vacant the revenues of the see were paid into the royal exchequer till the next consecration, and all the patronage meanwhile was transferred to the queen. When Bishop Cox died

in 1561, no successor was appointed to Ely for eighteen years; the sees of Chichester, Bristol, Worcester, Bath and Wells, and Salisbury were severally kept vacant for terms varying from three to ten years; but the most flagrant case of all was that of Oxford, which for forty-one years of this reign was without any bishop, the income during all this time presumably being paid to the queen's account! Elizabeth's last years were sad years, and as they passed life ceased more and more to have any charm for her. She acted her part with indomitable courage, played at being young when there was hardly any one about her who had not been a child when she was a grown woman, and fought death to the last as if she would by sheer force of will keep him at bay.

After Essex's return in defiance of orders it was evident that he could hope for no further advancement. He could not endure the humiliation, could not acquiesce in a blighted career, though he had only himself to blame, and by his ridiculously abortive attempt at insurrection left the queen no other alternative than to send him to the scaffold. The story of the ring which Essex is said to have sent to the queen after his condemnation, and which was detained by the Countess of Nottingham, is another of those idle and mischievous inventions which have been very widely circulated among the credulous and been repeated by historians [see DEVEREUX, ROBERT, second EARL OF ESSEX]. Essex was beheaded on 25 Feb. 1601. As it had been with the Duke of Norfolk thirty-two years before, so it was now; Elizabeth was reluctant to give Essex to the executioner, but she had scarcely any option; and precisely as it had been at the time of the northern rebellion so was it again ordered that the lives of the nobility and gentry implicated were spared, but immense fines were levied upon them. Unless Chamberlain exaggerated the amounts, the aggregate can have fallen little short of 100,000*l.* (CHAMBERLAIN, *Letters*, pp. 107–10). It has been said that the queen exhibited signs of grief and remorse at the death of Essex. There is little or no evidence of her taking his death much to heart till long after the execution; and it may be doubted whether she dwelt much upon it at the time. In May she held a splendid chapter of the order of the Garter at Windsor, and the Earl of Derby and Lord Burghley (Sir Robert Cecil's elder brother) were installed knights. During the whole of that summer and autumn she was amusing herself after the old fashion. There are few more graphic pictures of her while giving an audience when she was in good humour than is to be found in Sir William Brown's report of this reception by the queen at Sir William Clarke's house in August (*Sydney Papers*, ii. 229–30). She certainly was lively enough then. Next month she snatched away the miniature of Cecil from his niece and danced about with it like a skittish schoolgirl [see CECIL, ROBERT]. During all that year she seems to have been in exuberant spirits, and on 12 Dec. Cecil, in a private letter, rejoices in 'the happy continuance of her majesty's health and prosperity' (*Cal.*, Dom. 1601–3, p. 128). It is not till February 1602 that we first hear of her health beginning to fail; when a correspondent of Sir Dudley Carleton expresses his regret at the queen's 'craziness' (*ib.* p. 156). The account which De Beaumont gives of his interview with her in June is quite incredible (BIRCH, ii. 505). Indeed, De Beaumont's despatches are very untrustworthy, and no dependence can be placed upon his idle gossip when unsupported by corroborative evidence. On 28 April we find her actually dancing with the Duke of Nevers at Richmond; but in August we hear of her again being unwell, though 'the next day she walked abroad in the park [at Burnham] lest any should take notice of it.' It was but a passing indisposition, for the week before she had ridden ten miles on horseback, and hunted too (*ib.* p. 233). More than once during this autumn she was reported as being in good health (NICHOLS, *Progresses*, iii. 597, 600), but when Sir John Harrington was admitted to her presence at the end of December he was shocked to see the change in her. During the second week of the new year she caught a bad cold, but shook it off and was well enough to remove to Richmond on 21 Jan. (1603). On 28 Feb. she sickened again, and on 15 March she was alarmingly ill. She rapidly grew worse, refused all medicine, and took little nourishment, but declined to go to bed. The lords of the council were sent for and continued in attendance till the end. Archbishop Whitgift performed the last offices of religion. She became speechless and died very quietly on 24 March, her council standing round her and interpreting a sign she made to mean that she wished James VI of Scotland to succeed her on the throne.

Elizabeth was in her seventieth year when she died. She was the first English sovereign who had attained to such an age, though Henry III and Edward III had reigned for a longer time. She was buried with great magnificence in Westminster Abbey on 28 April. James I erected a noble monument over the grave where her remains lie side by side with those of her sister Mary.

In person Elizabeth was a little over middle height, and when she came to the throne she must have been a beautiful young woman, with a profusion of auburn hair, a broad commanding brow, and regular features that were capable of rapid changes of expression as her hazel eyes flashed with anger or sparkled with merriment. Her portraits appear to have been all more or less 'idealised;' their number is so great that it is to be wondered that no monograph has yet been attempted dealing with them at all adequately. By far the most impressive picture of her which has been engraved is Mark Gerard's portrait at Burleigh House; it forms the frontispiece to the first volume of Wright's 'Elizabeth and her Times.' The daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn could hardly have missed inheriting some of the personal beauty of her parents, but she was emphatically her father's child. From him she got her immense physical vigour, her magnificent constitution, her powerful intellect, a frame which seemed incapable of fatigue, and a nervous system that rendered her almost insensible to fear or pain. Her life was the life of a man, not of a woman; she could hunt all day, dance or watch masques and pageants all night, till the knees of strong men trembled under them as they wearily waited in attendance upon her person; yet she never seemed to suffer from the immense tension at which she lived. With her amazing energy, her want of all sympathy for weakness, her fierce wilfulness and self-assertion, and a certain coarseness of fibre, it was inevitable that she should be unfeminine. She swore, she spat upon a courtier's coat when it did not please her taste, she beat her gentlewomen soundly, she kissed whom she pleased, she gave Essex a good stinging blow on the face, she called the members of her privy council by all sorts of nicknames; but woe to him who should presume to take liberties with her, forget that she was his queen, or dare by word or deed to cross her when she was bent upon any course. The infamous maiming of John Stubbes for writing a pamphlet against the Anjou marriage is a hideous instance of her occasional ferocity; the lifelong imprisonment of the Earl of Arundel illustrates her vindictiveness. Her early education, hard, prosaic, and masculine as it was, must have been conducted with great care. It was a severe training, but there was nothing in it to soften her, to stimulate her imagination, or to refine her tastes. With the Roman poets she appears to have never had any acquaintance. Latin and French she learnt colloquially, and acquired a perfect command of them; her French letters are better compositions than her English ones. Italian she did not speak with ease, and Greek she probably never was much at home in. The few attempts at English verse which she indulged in are worthless. She was a facile performer upon more than one musical instrument, and in 1599 she sent over Thomas Dallam [q. v.] with an organ which she presented to the sultan Mahomet III, and which took the builder more than a year to set up (*Addit. MSS.* 17480). She had little or no taste for pictorial art, and her passion for dress was barbaric. Her memory was extraordinary. When the ambassador of Sigismund, king of Poland, presented his letters of credence in July 1597, and took occasion to deliver an harangue which provoked her by its impertinence, Elizabeth electrified him and the court by hurling a long speech at him in Latin, rating him roundly for his presumption. It was certainly spoken on the spur of the moment, and when she ended she turned laughingly to her council, half surprised at her own fluency. For literature, as we now understand the term, it is curious that she never appears to have had any taste. Some of Shakespeare's plays were performed in her presence, but she looked upon such matters as pastime—one show was as good as another. Camden notes that once, shortly after the execution of Mary Stuart, she took to reading books, as if it were quite unusual. When she did turn to study it was only a recurring to the authors she had gone through in her girlhood; she translated Boethius and Sallust. She did not even care for learning or learned men. Camden was almost the only one of them in whom she showed any kindly interest; it is doubtful whether Richard Hooker owed to her even the trumpery country living of Bishopsbourne, Kent, where he died unnoticed in 1600. Spenser she seems never to have cared for; she lived quite outside that splendid intellectual activity which began at the close of her reign. Her parsimony was phenomenal. Her hatred of marriage and her irritation and wrath against any one who dared to take a wife at all secretly was almost a craze. Leicester, Essex, Raleigh, Sir Robert Carey, John Donne, and many another, are instances of those whom she could not forgive for simply marrying on the sly (see Hallam, *Const. Hist.* vol. i. ch. iv. p. 174). Yet, when all is said that can be said to prove that she had her weaknesses and her faults, it amounts to no more than this, that she was human; and when all deductions have been made that the most captious criticism can collect, her name will go down to posterity as one of the

great personages in history, the virgin queen, who by sheer force of character gained for herself the credit of all the grand achievements which her people effected in peace or war, whose name was held in something more than honour from Persia to Peru, from Russia to Algiers, who crushed the tremendous power of Spain, broke for ever the spiritual tyranny of Rome, and lifted England into the first rank among the kingdoms of the world.

[The materials for the biography of Elizabeth are very voluminous. Camden's Annals, brought down to the end of 1588, was the first important historical account of the reign, and was published in 1615. It is said to have been undertaken at the suggestion of Lord Burghley. Bishop Francis Godwin's Annales of England are an extension and completion of Camden's, and are at least as valuable. An English translation was published in folio by his son Morgan in 1630. Godwin was an intimate friend of Camden. The earliest life of the queen was that by Gregorio Leti, who appears to have had access to some manuscript sources which have since then disappeared. The original edition was suppressed by authority. A French translation, La Vie d'Elisabeth reine d'Angleterre, was published in 2 vols. 12mo, Amsterdam, 1694. Miss Strickland's Life, with all its shortcomings, is the best personal memoir of the queen which has yet appeared. M. Louis Wiesener's La Jeunesse d'Elisabeth d'Angleterre, 1533–1558 (Paris, 1878; translated into English by C. M. Yonge, 1879), tells with care the story before she ascended the throne. Mr. Froude's history of the reign is indispensable to the historian, though very unequal in parts. It is, however, incomparably more trustworthy and thorough than the history of the three earlier reigns. Queen Elizabeth and her Times, by Thomas Wright, 2 vols. 8vo, 1838, is an attempt to give a picture of the reign from a large number of private letters printed for the first time from the originals in the British Museum and elsewhere. Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth from the year 1581 till her death, by Thomas Birch, D.D., 2 vols. 4to, 1754, are based upon the papers of Anthony Bacon and other original records. This is a work of prime importance for the latter half of the reign. Naunton's Fragmenta Regalia, first published in 1694, with the spurious Arcana Aulica, professing to be by Sir Francis Walsingham, contains lively sketches and anecdotes, which must be read with caution. The same is true of Sir John Harrington's Brief View. Sir Dudley Digges's Compleat Ambassador, fol. 1655, is the great authority on all that concerns the Anjou marriage (1570–1581). The work is not his, but was published from papers found in Digges's library after his death. For the parliamentary history of the reign D'Ewes's Journals of the Parliaments of Queen Elizabeth is invaluable. Nichols's Progresses contains a rich mine of information on the habits and private life of the queen. The life of Walsingham is the only biography of any of the great statesmen of the reign which is still unwritten [see the sources for these in the volumes of this dictionary under Cecil, Davison, Devereux, Dudley]. Sir Harris Nicolas's Life of Sir Christopher Hatton (1847), Edwards's Life of Sir Walter Ralegh (2 vols. 1868), The Letter-books of Sir Amyas Paulet, Keeper of Mary Queen of Scots, edited by the Rev. John Morris, S.J. (1874), deserve to be consulted, as do the many publications bearing upon this reign which have been issued by the Camden Society—The Letters of Elizabeth and James VI (1849), Walsingham's Chronicle (1875–7), Machyn's Diary and Manningham's Diary (1848)—from all of which some scraps of information have been derived. Tytler's England under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary contains some curious notices of Elizabeth before she came to the throne. The Burghley, Hardwicke, Sadler, Sydney, and other state papers need only be named. Dr. Forbes's Full View of the Public Transactions in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, 2 vols. fol. 1740, is an important work, but not of much use to the biographer. Hallam's account of the reign in the Constitutional History is eminently candid and philosophical. Lingard's, though his bias might be supposed to warp his judgment, is a remarkable monument of his critical impartiality, and it may be doubted whether any more succinct and trustworthy history of the time has yet appeared. The Calendar of the MSS. at Hatfield House has only got as far as the year 1582, although two volumes have been printed. In the second part a large number of the Alençon love-letters are printed *in extenso*. The Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland, 1509–1603 (2 vols.), is of occasional assistance. Motley's great works on the Revolt of the Netherlands and the Rise of the Dutch Republic are not quite as exhaustive as is generally assumed. For the French wars Martin is the chief authority. For all that concerns the treatment of the Romanists Tierney's edition of Dodd's Church History, with its valuable appendices of original documents, and the very careful Introduction to the Douay Diary, by Mr. Knox, may be referred to. See too One Generation of a Norfolk House, by the present writer, where a long list of authorities is given. For ecclesiastical matters in England Strype stands alone, and his volumes must always remain the great storehouse from which we must draw. But it is from the compilers of the Calendars of State Papers (Domestic) in the Record Office, and especially from Mrs. Everett Green's six volumes, that the chief information is to be derived. If the Lansdowne, Cotton, and Harleian MSS. were calendared on the same scale, we should probably have at least another six volumes to consult. It is curious how very little the eighteen years' labours of the Hist. MSS. Commission have added to our knowledge of Elizabeth's reign, except, and the exception is a very large one, such new information as the Hatfield papers supply.] A. J.

ELIZABETH (1635–1650), princess, second daughter of Charles I, was born at St. James's Palace, 28 Dec. 1635. She had not reached the second year of her age when her grandmother, Mary de Medicis, proposed to arrange a match between her and William, only son of Frederick Henry, prince of Orange, but Charles at that time considered such a marriage to be beneath his daughter's rank. When in the spring of 1642 the Princess Mary was betrothed to Prince William, and Henrietta Maria accompanied her to Holland, Elizabeth had to part both from her sister and her mother. For the next few years she led a secluded life, with no other relation than her little brother, Henry, duke of Gloucester. In October 1642, when the commons made provision for her maintenance, it was proposed to cashier the principal members of her household, as being either papists or non-subscribers to the covenant. Greatly distressed at this proposal, Elizabeth ventured an appeal from the commons to the lords, to whom she dictated a touching letter (*Lords' Journals*, vi. 341). Her appeal was partially successful, the change was less sweeping than had been originally contemplated; but to balance this act of complaisance, the poor children had to listen twice on Sunday to the dreary oratory of Stephen Marshall and his kind, besides being catechised in true puritan fashion.

Always a delicate child, Elizabeth in the autumn of 1643, while running across a room, fell and broke her leg, which occasioned a long confinement. In July 1644 change of air was recommended, and the princess and her brother were removed to the residence of Sir John Danvers at Chelsea. During the weary years which she passed in separation from her parents and friends, Elizabeth sought consolation in the study of languages and theology. Her lessons were mostly received from a learned lady, Mrs. Makin, who professed herself competent to teach at least six languages. A tradition represents Elizabeth as being able to read and write Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, and Italian before she was eight years old. In dedicating to her a learned 'Exposition of the first five chapters of Ezekiel,' published in March 1644–5, the author, William Greenhill, after mentioning various instances of feminine precocity, extols her 'writing out the Lord's Prayer in Greek, some texts of Scripture in Hebrew,' her 'endeavour after the exact knowledge of those holy tongues, with other languages and learned accomplishments,' her 'diligent hearing of the word, careful noting of sermons, understanding answers at the catechising, and frequent questioning about holy things.' Three years later another erudite scholar, Alexander Rowley, in dedicating to the princess a vocabulary of the Hebrew and Greek words used in the Bible, with their explanation in Latin and English, entitled 'The Schollers Companion,' 1648, gives as his reason the 'rare inclination of your highness to the study of the Book of books, and of its two originall languages.' On the death of her governess, the Countess of Dorset, in the spring of 1645, Elizabeth and her brother were transferred to the guardianship of the Earl and Countess of Northumberland, under whose care they passed a happy summer at one of the earl's country residences, probably Syon House, Isleworth, Middlesex. In September, when residing at St. James's, they were joined by the youthful Duke of York, to whom Elizabeth expressed her regret at seeing him in the hands of his father's foes, and repeatedly told him 'that were she a boy she would not long remain a captive, however light or glittering might be the fetters that bound her.' After a separation of five years Elizabeth was permitted to meet her father at Maidenhead, Berkshire, 16 July 1647, and spend two days with him at Caversham. A pretty anecdote is told of her graceful recognition of Fairfax, whom she here saw for the first time. Her gentle bearing towards her own and her father's opponents gained for her the name of 'Temperance.' On Charles being removed to Hampton Court he paid frequent visits to his children, then at Syon House; but after his confinement in Carisbrooke Castle, and their own removal to London, Elizabeth took every opportunity of urging on the Duke of York to escape, according to their father's wish, and it was probably owing to her ingenuity that he was enabled to do so in the guise of a woman on the evening of 21 April 1648. It is doubtful whether Elizabeth became fully acquainted with the events of the fateful autumn and winter of 1648. Her guardian kept her in the country, contrary to custom, during the winter, with a view perhaps of sparing her intelligence of proceedings which he himself refused to countenance. On 22 Jan. 1648–9 Elizabeth, it may be at her father's desire, wrote to the parliament requesting permission to withdraw to Holland, to her sister the Princess of Orange; but amid the pressure of affairs her letter received no attention. During his trial the king inquired of one who had been with his children how his 'young princess did;' the reply was that she was very melancholy; 'and well she may be so,' he replied, 'when she hears what death her old father is coming unto.' After sentence had been passed on the king Elizabeth lay prostrate with grief;

indeed, she was everywhere reported to be dead. The parting interview took place on 29 Jan. When Elizabeth saw her father so sadly changed since they had parted only fifteen months before, she burst into a passion of tears, and it was some time before she could listen calmly to his last instructions. The conversation that ensued has been recorded by herself. 'Most sorrowful was this parting,' writes Sir Thomas Herbert, who was present, 'the young princess shedding tears and crying lamentably, so as moved others to pity that formerly were hard-hearted' (*Two Last Years of Charles I*, ed. 1702, p. 125). Elizabeth was taken back to Syon House. She never recovered from the effects of her father's death. In April she renewed her request to be allowed to join her sister in Holland without success. In June parliament assigned her to the care of the Earl and Countess of Leicester at Penshurst, Kent. Here she was again fortunate in the choice of a tutor, a descendant in the female line of the Sydneys, named Lovel, who proved also a faithful friend. Lady Leicester, while complying in the main with parliamentary instructions, treated her ward with kindness, even tenderness. 'Her forlorn situation, combined with her reputation for learning, her profound melancholy and meek resignation,' remarks her biographer, 'interested many a heart in her fate.' John Quarles, son of Francis Quarles of emblematic fame, dedicated to her in April 1649 his 'Regale Lectum Miseriæ' as to 'that patronesse of Vertue . . . the sorrowfull daughter to our late martyr'd Soveraigne.' A more elaborate panegyric occurs in the dedication by Christopher Wase of a translation of the 'Electra of Sophocles: presented to her Highnesse the Lady Elizabeth; with an Epilogue, shewing the Parallell in two Poems, The Return, and the Restauration,' 1649, to which an anonymous friend of the author, H. P., added some verses strongly expressive of his abhorrence at what he considered to be her unworthy treatment. When in the summer of 1650 the news came of Charles II having landed in Scotland, it was resolved to remove the royal children to Carisbrooke Castle. Horrified at the prospect of passing her days in what had been her father's prison, Elizabeth vainly petitioned the council of state to be allowed to remain at Penshurst on the plea of her bad health (*Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1650, p. 261). Within less than a week after her arrival at Carisbrooke she was struck down by fever, the result of a wetting, and died on the afternoon of 8 Sept. 1650. On the 24th she was buried in St. Thomas's Church, Newport, in a small vault near the communion-table. For two centuries the initials 'E. S.' cut in that part of the wall nearest to it served to mark the spot; but in 1856 a white marble monument by Marochetti was placed in the church to her memory by command of the queen. Three days before she died the council of state had agreed to recommend the parliament to accede to her request to go to her sister in Holland, and to allow 1,000*l.* a year for her maintenance 'so long as she should behave inoffensively' (*ib.* pp. 327–8).

The only authentic portrait of Elizabeth now known to be in existence is at Syon House. An engraved portrait of her, in the mourning which she never laid aside from the day of her father's death, is prefixed to Wase's translation of the 'Electra;' it is without name, but is believed to be by Francis Barlow. There is also a quarto engraving by Robert Vaughan, representing her at the age of five, at p. 13 of 'The true Effigies of . . . King Charles,' &c., 4to, London, 1641; and another by W. Hollar.

[Green's Lives of the Princesses of England, vi. 335–92; Kelly's Hampshire Directory (1885), p. 1049; Cal. State Papers, Dom. 1649–50; Granger's Biog. Hist. of England (2nd ed.), ii. 100, iii. 4; Bromley's Cat. of Engraved Portraits, p. 67; Evans's Cat. of Engraved Portraits, i. 113, ii. 141; Lowndes's Bibl. Manual (Bohn), i. 415.]

G. G.

ELIZABETH (1596–1662), queen of Bohemia, eldest daughter of James VI of Scotland (afterwards James I of England) and his consort Anne of Denmark, was born at Falkland Castle in Fifeshire 19 (according to others 15 or 16) Aug. 1596. To the great indignation of the presbyterian ministers, the care of the infant princess was at first entrusted to Lord Livingstone, soon afterwards Earl of Linlithgow, whose wife was a Roman catholic [see ANNE OF DENMARK], and under his care she and her younger sister, Margaret, were brought up, chiefly at the palace of Linlithgow, during the remainder of their parents' residence in Scotland. At the beginning of June 1603 Elizabeth accompanied her mother on her progress into England, where the Countess of Kildare was immediately appointed governess to the princess. In the course of the remainder of her journey south Elizabeth paid her first visit to Combe Abbey, near Coventry, which was soon afterwards to become her home. The interval she spent at court and at Oatlands in the company of her much-loved brother, Henry, prince of Wales. But when the discovery of the plots known as the Main and the Bye led to the arrest of Lord Cobham, Lady Kildare's second husband, it was decided to relieve her of the

charge of the princess, whose 'keeping and education' were, by a privy seal order dated 19 Oct., committed to the care of Lord Harington and his wife. After a brief sojourn at Lord Harington's family seat, Exton in Rutlandshire, Elizabeth took up her residence at Combe Abbey, the inheritance of Lady Harington, where, with the exception of a few visits to court from the middle of 1606 onwards, she remained continuously till the end of 1608. No guardianship could have been more happily chosen than that to which she had been entrusted. Both Lord Harington and his wife were 'persons eminent for prudence and piety' (see the Character of their son in HARINGTON, *Nugæ Antiquæ*, ed. 1804, ii. 307), and the former with characteristic zeal devoted himself altogether to his new duties. He had a worthy helpmate in his wife; their niece, Lady Anne Dudley, became the princess's intimate friend. Elizabeth's establishment at Combe Abbey included, besides her former mistress-nurse, Lady Dunkerrant (a member of the Linlithgow family), various tutors in languages and in other accomplishments. Several childish notes are preserved from the princess's hand, of which the earliest appears to refer to her recent removal to Combe Abbey. They are written in English, French, or Italian, and addressed in affectionate terms to her father, and more especially to her favourite brother Prince Henry (see the *Letters to King James VI* from the members of his family, printed for the Maitland Club, 1835, and the specimens from *Harl. MS.* 6986 in ELLIS, *Original Letters*, 1st ser. iii. 89–91). The protestant sentiments which Elizabeth throughout her life consistently exhibited were no doubt largely due to the influence of the Haringtons. Combe Abbey lay in the heart of a district on which the conspirators of the Gunpowder plot materially depended. They had agreed that on the very day of the intended demonstration-in-chief at Westminster the young princess should be seized by a body of gentlemen, who were to assemble on the pretext of a hunting match to be held by Sir Everard Digby at Dunchurch, about eight miles distant from Combe Abbey. If the plot succeeded, either Prince Charles or Elizabeth was to be proclaimed sovereign on the principles of the unreformed church. But a warning had reached Combe Abbey just in time from London, and the princess was conveyed by Lord Harington to Coventry, where the townsmen loyally armed in her defence.

From the end of 1608 onwards Elizabeth appears to have frequently resided at court, occupying a special suite of apartments at Hampton Court, or another in the Cockpit at Whitehall, in addition to an establishment which had been formed for her at Kew. She occasionally performed in masks, such as Daniel's 'Tethys's Festival,' acted at Whitehall 5 June 1610, in which she represented the nymph of the Thames. She was already the frequent theme of poetic offerings, though the most charming lines inspired by her beauty, Sir Henry Wotton's tribute to her as the rose among the violets, were not written till after she had become a queen. Soon overtures began to be made to King James for the hand of his daughter. One of the earliest offers came from Charles IX of Sweden on behalf of his son, Gustavus Adolphus, which seems to have formed part of a general scheme of the Swedish king to negotiate a quadruple alliance with England, France, and the States-General (GEIJER, *Geschichte von Schweden*, ii. 352). But the Danish interest at the English court easily prevailed against the proposal. On the other hand, Queen Anne warmly supported a plan hatched towards the end of 1611 for a marriage between Elizabeth and King Philip of Spain, which was openly denounced by the Prince of Wales, and in the end, by the advice of Salisbury, allowed to fall through. A directly opposite policy was suggested by the fears of James that in case of a general European conflict the Hispano-French alliance, ultimately cemented by a double marriage, would unduly depress the balance. James I accordingly, in March 1612, concluded a treaty of alliance with the princes of the German protestant union; and on 16 May following a marriage-contract was signed between Elizabeth and the head of the union, the young Elector Palatine Frederick V. When, 16 Oct. of this year, the palsgrave, as he was called in England, arrived on these shores, he was generally welcomed as a handsome and intelligent young prince, as the nephew of the famous warrior Maurice, prince of Orange, and as himself heir to a great though uncertain future. His approaching marriage was universally regarded as a great political event, since it would connect the English royal family with some of the chief protestant courts in Europe. The cold water thrown on her daughter's happiness by the queen [see ANNE OF DENMARK] of course only strengthened this impression. The young elector had made the acquaintance of Elizabeth, and they had, as may for once be safely asserted, fallen in love with each other, when Henry, prince of Wales, suddenly died (6 Nov.) His sister had not been allowed to see him during the last five days of his life, though she had even attempted to visit him in disguise. His last conscious words had

been, 'Where is my dear sister?' (GARDINER, ii. 158). The funeral was swiftly followed by her wedding. Mrs. Green is of opinion that the stanzas printed (in *Nugæ Antiquæ*, ii. 411) as 'written by the Princess Elizabeth,' and by her 'given to Lord Harington of Exton, her preceptor,' were composed under the influence of her great sorrow. Her wedding was fixed for the first day of the carnival week of 1613. Nearly every prominent writer of the day contributed to the rejoicings, among them experienced authors of masks, such as Chapman, Beaumont, Campion, and Heywood; besides Donne and Wither, and of course university wits innumerable. Ben Jonson was absent in France, but his co-operation was not indispensable to Inigo Jones, and Sir Francis Bacon and John Taylor, the Water-Poet, 'contrived' their devices themselves. But there was some anxiety in the midst of these festivities; nor was it a wholly idle curiosity which noted that there was missing among the representatives of foreign powers invited to the wedding the Spanish ambassador, who 'was, or would be, sick.' (For ample accounts of the wedding festivities and subsequent festivities in England and Germany, and a bibliography of the literature of the subject, see NICHOLS, *Progresses of James I*, ii. 463–626, and the other authorities cited by MRS. GREEN.)

At last, towards the end of April 1613, the young electress and her husband found themselves on board the Prince Royal, and made a joyous entry into Heidelberg 17 June of the same year. For many a day afterwards Elizabeth's life continued to be one of festivities, masquerades, banquets, and huntings. The fashions of life which she brought with her, and the rate of her and her husband's expenditure, effected something like a revolution in the social life of the palatinate (see HÄUSSER, *Pfalz*, i. 270 seqq.) Her personal establishment, numbering 374 souls, was unheard of in its vastness, and her income caused only less astonishment than her extravagance. Her husband had inherited a tendency to self-indulgence, and a love of building in particular. Yet there was much of real refinement in the life of the young electoral couple, who moreover set a consistent example of conjugal affection. On 2 Jan. 1614 their eldest son was born. One sickly life alone stood between this child, Frederick Henry, and the thrones of the three kingdoms; fifteen years afterwards, when his parents were exiles in Holland, he was drowned in his father's presence off Haarlem in the Zuider Zee. Their second son, Charles Lewis (afterwards elector palatine), was born at Heidelberg 24 Dec. 1617, and their eldest daughter, Elizabeth, 26 Dec. 1618. On the death of the Emperor Matthias the Bohemian estates, after deposing Archduke Ferdinand of Styria from the Bohemian throne as successor to which he had been previously accepted, chose in his place the Elector Palatine Frederick V. This occurred 26 Aug., only two days before Ferdinand himself was elected emperor at Frankfort. Frederick afterwards accounted for his acceptance of the Bohemian crown by describing himself as having taken this step in obedience to an inner voice, which he thought spoke the will of God. But it has generally been supposed that it was the Electress Elizabeth who determined her husband's action. The assumption is altogether unsupported by evidence (see OPEL, p. 294; SÖLTL, i. 153; FEDER, *Sophie Churfürstinn von Hannover*, 2). As to her having taken any part in the deliberations which preceded Frederick's acceptance of the crown, we possess the unexceptionable testimony of her granddaughter Elizabeth, duchess of Orleans, the most candid of women, to the fact that at the time of the offer of the Bohemian crown to her husband the electress 'knew nothing whatever about the matter, and in those days thought of nothing but plays, masquerades, and the reading of romances' (see the quotation from her *Letters*, ed. Menzel, ap. HÄUSSER, ii. 311 *n.*) On the other hand, when consulted by the elector before the step was actually taken, she wrote to him that she left the decision in his hands, but at the same time declared her readiness, should he accept, to follow the divine call, and she added that she would willingly in case of need pledge her jewels and everything else she possessed in the world (SÖLTL, u.s.)

Her difficulties began at Prague, where she arrived with her husband 31 Oct. 1619 and was crowned three days after him, 7 Nov. There is no direct proof that she had any share in the mistakes of commission by which King Frederick made his mistakes of omission more glaring. Her court chaplain, Alexander Scapman (PESCHECK, *Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Böhmen*, 1844, i. 381 *n.*), is not stated to have given his sanction to the iconoclasm instigated or encouraged by her husband's spiritual director, Abraham Scultetus (Schulz); in fact, there is nothing to show that she ever adopted Calvinistic views. Though in the days of her exile her children were instructed in the Heidelberg catechism, she had the services of a church of England chaplain (see her *Unpublished Letters* of 1656, ed. Evans, pp. 242–3). Such offence as she gave at Prague was probably due to an inborn levity which she never learnt altogether to restrain; but for political diffi-

culties this would probably have been forgiven. The hostile annalist (KHEVENHILLER, *Annales Ferdinandei*, ix. 662) relates how after the wives of the citizens at Prague had excited the derision of the young court by their traditional offerings of the triumphs of bakery, they were at pains to avail themselves of the next occasion for presenting a more suitable gift. This was the golden cradle presented for the use of Prince Rupert, Elizabeth's third and perhaps favourite child, born 26 Dec. 1619 amidst rumours and forebodings of the impending struggle.

Naturally enough, when in 1620 this struggle approached its crisis, the queen's spirits occasionally sank, and her husband, writing from his camp, had to exhort her affectionately not to give way to melancholy, but to be prepared for the worst (the letters dated 22 Oct. and 1 Nov. 1620 in BROMLEY's *Royal Letters*, pp. 7–11, certainly give the impression that at this time Frederick's mood was firmer than his wife's). But when, 8 Nov., the battle of Prague had been fought, and there only remained the question whether the palatinate could be preserved, Elizabeth showed her courage. From Breslau, whither she had accompanied her husband after quitting Prague on the evening of the battle, she wrote to her father praying him to take pity on her and hers, but adding that for herself she had resolved not to desert her husband (see the letter in ELLIS, *Original Letters*, 1st ser. iii. 112–14). The narrative of an Englishman attached to the Bohemian army, or court (*ib.* 114), describes both the king and the queen, 'the queen especially,' as exhibiting great self-control and devotion. By Christmas time 1620 she found a momentary shelter, which her husband's brother-in-law, the Elector George William, would have much preferred to deny her, in the Brandenburg fortress of Küstrin; and here was born, on 16 Jan. 1621, her fifth child, Maurice. On the arrival of her husband at Küstrin, where the queen and her followers had hardly been provided with sufficient food, they had to move on to Berlin. Here they found themselves neither welcome nor secure, though a refuge was offered at the Elector George William's court to their children. Thus it came to pass that the early training of Elizabeth's eldest daughter and namesake (afterwards the learned and pietistic abbess of Herford) fell into the hands of her grandmother, Louisa Juliana, a daughter of the great William Orange, and herself soon afterwards a fugitive at Berlin. Frederick and Elizabeth journeyed on separately to Wolfenbüttel, meeting again in Holland, where, 14 April 1621, they were jointly received by Maurice of Orange in the midst of a brilliant assemblage. But the Stadholder had his hands full, and the hopes of the fugitives were still chiefly directed to England, where their cause was extraordinarily popular. While, however, King James contented himself with sending Lord Digby to Brussels and then to Vienna in order to see that in the hoped-for peace provision might, if possible, be made for the restoration of the palatinate, the protestant union was dissolving itself (April 1621), and the emperor was preparing to order the execution of the ban under which Frederick had been placed by him. The greater part of the palatinate was in the hands of the Spaniards, and the upper palatinate was seized by Maximilian, duke of Bavaria, to whom, not long afterwards, Frederick's electorate was transferred at the conference of princes held at Ratisbon (1622–3).

It was about this time that the Queen of Hearts, by which name, according to a contemporary (James Howell to his father, 19 March 1623, see *Epistolæ Ho-Elianæ*, edition 1754, p. 91), the queen of Bohemia was called 'for her winning princely comportment,' found an unselfishly devoted knight in the person of her cousin, Duke Christian of Brunswick, the administrator of the bishopric of Halberstadt, a young soldier who was her junior by three years. It is possible that he had first met the fugitive queen at Wolfenbüttel, but there is no actual evidence of Christian having ever set eyes upon her before he began his campaigns in her cause. On the other hand, in an extant letter from Elizabeth to her frequent correspondent, the diplomatist Sir Thomas Roe (*cit.* ap. OPEL, 307), she states that 'he hath ingaged himself onelie for my sake in our quarell.' One letter from him to the queen, quoted at length by Mrs. Green, is signed by him as 'your most humblest, most constant, most faithful, most affectionate, and most obedient slave, who loves you, and will love you, infinitely and incessantly to death.' It thus becomes superfluous to inquire very closely into the authenticity of the story of his having placed one of her gloves in his helmet, with a vow that he would return it to her within the walls of her reconquered Bohemian capital; which story it appears cannot be traced further back than 1646 (WITTICH, whose essay on Christian and Elizabeth in the *Zeitschrift für preussische Geschichte, &c.*, 1869, is cited by OPEL, traces it back to the *Annales Trevirenses* of 1670, but according to WESCAMP, *Herzog Christian von Braunschweig und die Stifter Münster und Paderborn*, 1884, these Annals are based on Lotichius, 1670). From

the evidence of his letters one can hardly doubt that the 'madman,' as he was called, had conceived a genuine passion for the unfortunate queen, and that a kindly regard on her part was not wanting in return. In this it is pleasant to know that her husband shared (see BROMLEY, *Royal Letters*, 20). Christian's efforts were ineffective, but his willingness to serve the cause of Elizabeth had by no means been exhausted when in 1626 a fever put an end to his turbulent life.

Neither the tardy awakening of Elizabeth's father to the manœuvres of Spain, nor the intervention of her uncle, Christian IV of Denmark, brought about the recovery of the palatinate. The accession of her brother, Charles I, brought no help. Frederick and Elizabeth had in the meantime, after remaining for some time at the Hague, found that their supplies ran short, more especially when money was with difficulty obtainable in England. Thus, as their family continued to increase (their seven younger children, of whom Sophia was the last but one, were born in tolerably regular succession between 1623 and 1632), they chiefly resided at Rhenen, a retired place on the Rhine not very far below Arnheim. Evelyn describes their residence there as 'a neate palace or country house, built after the Italian manner as I remember' (*Diary*, s.d. 29 July 1641). Here Elizabeth's ardent nature and quick temper had to learn to command themselves as best they might. The enthusiasm which in these earlier years of her exile she excited in such persons as Dudley Carleton and Sir Henry Wotton, and the mirth occasionally displayed in her very businesslike correspondence with Sir Thomas Roe, prove her spirits to have remained unbroken; to this healthy condition of mind the strong bodily exercise of hunting and riding which she continued to affect may be supposed to have contributed. All her fortitude was needed, for in 1629 she lost her eldest son. Not long afterwards, in 1631 and 1632, the victories of Gustavus Adolphus aroused fresh hopes. But in the vast designs of the Swedish conqueror the restoration of the elector palatine was a merely secondary incident. Frederick's inheritance was liberated from the enemy, but he wrote despondently to his wife, for he was obliged to follow the Swedish king like a vassal without being allowed a separate command. In 1632 Gustavus Adolphus fell at Lützen, and a few days afterwards (29 Nov.) Frederick himself died at Mainz. In the previous year (1631) Elizabeth had lost another of her children, Charlotte, aged three years.

During the sixteen years following upon her loss of her husband her life may be described as a continual effort on behalf of her children. On receiving the news of Frederick's death, Charles I invited his sister to England, but she for the time declined his hospitality, informing him with much dignity that the custom of her late husband's country demanded that during the course of a year she should make no change in her establishment. She, however, strove to induce her brother to use his influence on behalf of the heir to the palatinate, her eldest surviving son, Charles Lewis, for whom in 1633 she levied a small army, and in 1634 she sent him to England to sue for his uncle's alliance (SÖLTL, ii. 266). But the peace of Prague (1635) again jeopardised the prospects of her house; and notwithstanding all the efforts of Charles Lewis and his mother (which may be pursued in detail in SÖLTL, vol. ii. bks. iii. and iv.), it was only in the peace of Westphalia (1648) that part of his inheritance, the Rhenish Palatinate, was definitively restored to him as an eighth electorate of the empire. During this period Elizabeth, to whom the States-General had after her husband's death generously continued the allowance made to him, nevertheless found herself in straits which gradually became less and less endurable. The intermittent aid which she received from England finally, under the pressure of the civil war, altogether stopped. The generosity of the house of Orange came to an end when, rather later (1650), the male line of that house was reduced to a single infant; with some of their female relatives of that house the exiled queen and her daughters seem to have been on terms the reverse of pleasant (see *Memoiren der Herzogin Sophie*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 40). As early as 1645 one of her sons describes her court as vexed by rats and mice, but worst of all by creditors; and her daughter Sophia satirically records that her mother's banquets were more luxurious than Cleopatra's, because diamonds as well as pearls had been sacrificed for the providing of them (*ib.* 43). And yet she continued to be the recipient of the bounty of the most faithful of her English friends, Lord Craven, who had first come to the Hague in 1632, and had fought by the side both of her husband and her son Rupert, with whom he had been taken prisoner in the action at Lemgo [see CRAVEN, WILLIAM, first earl of].

Elizabeth's relations to her children are the theme of warm admiration on the part of some of her biographers; but on this head there is room for scepticism. Her daughter Sophia says that she could not abide young children, to whom she much preferred her dogs and monkeys, so that she made it a practice to have her daughters educated at Leyden till they had fairly grown up,

(*Memoiren*, 34). This might be interpreted as malice on the part of Sophia. But except in the case of Rupert, for whom she clearly had a warm affection (see e.g. the letter misdated 1655 in Bromley's *Royal Letters*, 189), little cordiality of tone is observable between herself and the other members of that numerous family for whom she suffered so bravely. A large number of letters remain (see *ib.*) addressed to her by her son Charles Lewis, but he certainly gave her reason enough for discontent, both in his politic morigeration to the Commonwealth men in England and in his cold-blooded treatment of herself after his recovery of the palatinate (as to her opinion of his conduct in 1655 see *Unpublished Letters to Nicholas*, 235). Of her younger sons two became members of the church of Rome, and one of these, Philip, in 1646 incurred her deep resentment by his fatal affray with a Frenchman named De l'Épinay, who was in some way attached to her court, and who was suspected of being her lover. The incident moved Charles Lewis to address a letter to his mother craving forgiveness for his brother and implying a solemn reproof to herself (Bromley, *Royal Letters*, 133), and caused a lifelong breach between the queen and her eldest daughter, Elizabeth ('la Grecque'). Another daughter, Louisa Hollandina, several years afterwards (1658) escaped in secret from her mother's house to become a convert to the church of Rome and an abbess of a tolerably mundane type. The youngest daughter, Sophia, through whom Elizabeth was the ancestress of our Hanoverian line of kings, quitted the maternal roof after a less dramatic fashion, but no less willingly, in 1650 (*Memoiren*, 44. For a convenient summary of the fortunes of the family of Frederick and Elizabeth see Häusser, ii. 509 seqq.)

The death of Charles I deeply moved Elizabeth, who is said ever afterwards to have worn a mourning ring containing a piece of his hair, with a *memento mori*. Two of her sons had fought gallantly in his cause, but her own future, like that of her house, depended on their elder brother, the more politic Charles Lewis, to whom the peace ending the great European war had just restored part of his inheritance. In the peace the emperor had promised a payment of twenty thousand dollars to Elizabeth, and half that sum as a marriage portion to each of her daughters. The Rhenish Palatinate had, however, literally been stripped to the bone; its population was only a fragment of what it had been, and the elector Charles Lewis, who addressed himself loyally to the crying needs of his subjects, had neither money nor pity to spare for his mother. Nothing could be more painful than the correspondence which passed at this time between the elector and his mother (Sölti, ii. 448 seqq.; cf. Bromley, *Royal Letters*, 148–60, et al.) The states, she wrote, had consented to allow her a thousand florins a month till she could relieve them of her presence, but heaven alone knew when this could be accomplished. Her son, she reminded him, had failed to keep his promise of supplying her with money till he could pay her the whole of her jointure. In reply to her bitter complaints he sent a little money and many excuses; and gradually her hopes of seeing the palatinate again vanished into nothing. Thus she had to remain in Holland, a dependent on the patient goodnature of her hosts, deserted by her daughters, but in friendly correspondence with her 'royal' court, exiled like her own. There was probably a good deal of general resemblance between the two courts at this season, when 'reverent Dick Harding' enlivened the queen's leisure and Tom Killigrew made 'rare relations' of Queen Christina of Sweden, whom for a variety of reasons Elizabeth hated almost as heartily as Cromwell himself, to her mind clearly 'the beast in the Revelations' (Letter to Nicholas, 4 Jan. 1655, in Evelyn's *Diary*, edd. Bray and Wheatley, iv. 223).

At last Charles II, whom in 1650 she had wished to marry to her daughter Sophia (*Memoiren*, &c., p. 42), was restored. But Elizabeth had still to wait for many weary months before she was able to follow Charles II to England. Her debts were the first obstacle in the way, though in September 1660 parliament voted her a grant of 10,000*l.*, and in December an additional sum of the same amount. This aid was in all probability largely owing to the exertions of her friend Lord Craven. But no eagerness was manifested at the English court for her reception, and least of all by the selfish king. As late as the beginning of 1661 new overtures were made by Elizabeth to the elector palatine for establishing her at Frankenthal, but they were received as coldly as usual (Bromley, *Royal Letters*, pp. 228–9). In the end, her Dutch creditors consenting, very possibly with a view to expediting the payment of the 20,000*l.* voted to the queen, she announced to the Duke of Ormonde that she had resolved to come to England to congratulate the king upon his coronation. It is clear from this letter, dated 23 May 1661 (and quoted at length in Ellis, *Original Letters*, 1st ser. iii. 115; and by Mrs. Green), that no invitation had reached her from Charles II. When she was already on board,

'betwixt Delft and Delft's haven,' a letter from the king was delivered to her which attempted to delay her journey, but she answered that she could not go back now, but would stay no longer than the king should think fit. She went 'with a resolution to suffer all things constantly,' but with no intention to 'do as poor neece.' At the same time she wrote to Clarendon desiring his help (see her letter to Prince Rupert, ap. Bromley, pp. 188–9, misendorsed 1655). In England no ceremony greeted her arrival about the end of May, and instead of being lodged at court she took up her abode at the mansion hospitably offered her by the Earl of Craven, with its beautiful gardens, in Drury Lane. Charles seems not to have been lacking in politeness towards her. He granted her a pension, and promised that if possible her debts should be paid by parliament. She frequently appeared with the court in public, being on these occasions usually attended by Lord Craven, who acted as her master of the ceremonies (see Pepys, *Diary*, s.d. 17 Aug. 1661; cf. *ib.* 2 July 1661. Pepys had waited on the queen at the Hague, 17 May 1660, when he thought her 'a very debonaire, but a plain lady,' and witnessed her farewell to Charles II, 23 May, when before sailing for England he rechristened the Naseby by his own name). With the elector palatine she appears to have had some unpleasant correspondence concerning their respective rights of property in his father's furniture (Bromley, pp. 222–4); but clearly Prince Rupert, who now enjoyed great popularity in England, continued to show an affectionate interest in his mother. She seems to have had no thought of again quitting England, for on 8 Feb. 1662 she removed to a residence of her own, Leicester House in Leicester Fields. Here she died within less than a week, 13 Feb. 1662, and four days afterwards Evelyn recorded that 'this night was buried in Westminster Abbey the Queen of Bohemia, after all her sorrows and afflictions *being come to die in the arms of her nephew the king*.' Her will named her eldest surviving son as her heir; but the residue of her jewellery (after memorial bequests to each of her children) was bequeathed to her favourite, Prince Rupert, while the papers and family portraits belonging to her she bequeathed to her faithful servant Lord Craven, by whom they were placed at Combe Abbey, which became his own property by purchase.

A closer study of the life of the queen of Bohemia fails to leave the impression that she was a woman of unusual refinement or of unusual depth of character, but in other respects accounts for much of the charm exercised over so many of her contemporaries. As is proved by the numerous letters remaining from her hand, she was a woman of considerable mental vigour and of inexhaustible vivacity, who seems never to have either felt or provoked weariness. She was tenacious both of her affections and of her hatreds; her husband and children found in her a devoted wife and mother, whose life was one long self-sacrifice to their interests. In return, though many princesses have been admired with equal ardour, none has ever been served with more unselfish fidelity than she; it was one thing to excite an enthusiasm such as that which on the morrow of the Bohemian catastrophe is said to have led thirty gentlemen of the Middle Temple to swear on their drawn swords to live or die in her service, and another to inspire a lifelong devotion of deeds in champions so different from one another as Christian of Halberstadt and Lord Craven. Lastly, amidst all the untoward experiences of her career she remained consistently true to the protestant cause which was dear to the great majority of the English nation, and of which that nation long regarded her as a kind of martyr. And it was their attachment to principles thus steadfastly maintained by their ancestress which raised her descendants to her father's throne.

Among the numerous family portraits by Honthorst, the Princess Louisa Hollandina, and others bequeathed by the queen of Bohemia to Lord Craven and still preserved at Combe Abbey, those of herself, in many varieties of size and costume, but all displaying the same marked features, are the most striking and interesting. The picture, however, which is said to represent her and her husband as Venus and Adonis, shows no likeness to their portraits, and is probably misnamed. Other portraits of her are to be found in the National Portrait Gallery, at Herrenhausen and elsewhere; those in the first named are by Mireveldt and Honthorst. The best collection of engraved portraits of her is stated by Mrs. Green to be in the illustrated Granger in the print-room of the British Museum.

[It is very probable that the papers bequeathed by Elizabeth to Lord Craven and now the property of his descendant would throw additional light upon many passages of her life, although they are known to contain no evidence of any secret marriage between the queen and the earl. In the meantime the biography of Elizabeth by Mrs. Everett Green, forming part of her Lives of the Princesses of England (1849–51, reprinted 1854), is an admirable piece of work, based almost entirely upon documentary evidence, in-

cluding the Craven Papers, and treating its subject with so much fulness that it has been thought unnecessary in the above sketch to make special references to it or to the sources which it never fails scrupulously to indicate. Mrs. Green's Life has quite superseded the earlier Memoirs of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia, by Miss Benger (2 vols. 1825). Söltl's Elisabeth Stuart, forming vols. i. and ii. of his Religionskrieg in Deutschland (3 vols. Hamburg, 1840), is valuable, especially for the narrative of the endeavours and negotiations for the recovery of the palatinate down to the peace of Westphalia. Sybel's Historische Zeitschrift, vol. xxiii. (1870), contains an original and very interesting article on the Queen of Bohemia by J. O. Opel. See also vol. ii. of Häusser's Geschichte der rheinischen Pfalz (Heidelberg, 1856), and Gardiner's History of England from the Accession of James I, especially vols. ii. vii. and viii. (new edition). Sir George Bromley's Collection of Original Royal Letters (1787) contains much of the queen's correspondence, especially with her husband and her sons, Charles Lewis and Rupert, but is disfigured by many wrong dates and other blunders. Some of Elizabeth's juvenile letters are contained in the Maitland Club collection (1835) cited above; a series of fifteen letters written by her to Sir Edward Nicholas from 31 Aug. 1654 to 18 Jan. 1655 is printed in vol. iv. of Wheatley's edition of Bray's Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn (1879); and another series of twenty-five, from the same to the same, 26 April 1655–24 Jan. 1656, was edited by J. Evans for the Society of Antiquaries (1857). Her correspondence with Sir Thomas Roe and the despatches of her secretary Nethersole are among the materials used by Mrs. Green.] A. W. W

ELIZABETH, Princess of England and Landgravine of Hesse-Homburg (1770–1840), artist, seventh child and third daughter of George III and Queen Charlotte, was born at the queen's palace, Buckingham House, on 22 May 1770. She had the usual allowance of 2,000*l.* a year from the king, but was by her own report a bad economist. She early began to use her pencil, and was called 'The Muse.' In 1795 she designed a series of pictures entitled 'The Birth and Triumph of Cupid,' which were engraved by Tomkins, and published by the king at his own expense. In 1796 this series was reissued as 'The Birth and Triumph of Love,' dedicated to the queen, with poetical letterpress by Sir J. B. Burges [q. v.] Dean Vincent made the pictures the theme of his election verses at Westminster School. In 1804 the princess produced, with a frontispiece, 'Cupid turned Volunteer,' 4to, dedicated to Princess Augusta, with a poetical description by Thomas Park, F.S.A. In 1806 appeared 'The Power and Progress of Genius,' in twenty-four sketches, folio, each sketch signed 'Eliza, inv^{t} and sculp^{t},' and the princess says in her dedication to the queen that she is venturing before the public alone. In 1808 she established a society at Windsor for giving marriage portions to virtuous girls; shortly after she had her own residence assigned her, The Cottage, Old Windsor. She was always busy in philanthropic work, the patronage of literature, and attendance upon her father.

In 1818, on the evening of 7 April, at Buckingham House, she was married to Frederick Joseph Louis, the hereditary prince of Hesse-Homburg. Parliament voted her 10,000*l.* a year. In June she and her husband left for Germany, where in 1820, on the death of the prince's father, they succeeded as landgrave and landgravine, and established themselves at the family castle. There the princess devoted 6,000*l.* a year of her allowance to the settlement of the difficulties in which the public funds of Hesse-Homburg had become involved. She produced in seven subjects 'The New Doll, or Birthday Gift,' 8vo, and in four subjects 'The Seasons' (the Flower Girl, Milk Girl, Hop Girl, Wood Girl), her work being generally announced as that of 'an illustrious personage.' In 1822, and again in 1823, appeared fresh editions of her 'Love' in octavo, still with Burges's poetry. William Combe, or 'Doctor Syntax' [q. v.], also co-operated with her. In 1829 the landgrave died, and the princess, then dowager landgravine, took up her residence in Hanover, where, by one of the first acts of William IV, a palace was made over to her. In 1831 she paid a visit to England. In 1834, to benefit the poor of Hanover, she permitted a new issue of her 'Genius,' engraved (and considerably altered) by Ramberg, and illustrated by the poetry, in German, of Minna Witte, afterwards Maedler. This work, 4to, dedicated by the princess to the Duke of Cambridge in a lithographed autograph letter, realised 800 rixdollars profit for the poor-box, with 103 more in 1837. About this time the princess's health obliged her to pass the winters at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, and there she died on 10 Jan. 1840, aged 70. She was buried in the mausoleum of the landgraves of Hesse-Homburg. Her library was sold in London by Sotheby & Wilkinson in April 1863.

[Jesse's Memoirs of George III, ii. 531, iii. 134, 280–2, 452; Dict. of Living Authors; Hutton's Bland-Burges Papers, 277, 279, 294, 297, 298; Russell's Moore, ii. 99, vi. 206, viii. 203; Gent. Mag. for 1770, 1788, 1818, 1829, 1840.] J. H.

ELKINGTON, GEORGE RICHARDS (1801–1865), introducer of electro-plating, son of James Elkington, gilt-toy and spectacle

manufacturer, was born 17 Oct. 1801, at St. Paul's Square, Birmingham. In 1815 he was apprenticed to his uncles, Josiah and George Richards, of St. Paul's Square, where he early showed great business capabilities, and was soon taken into partnership. On the death of his uncles, Elkington came into sole possession of their business. His whole life was spent in Birmingham, where he was a governor of King Edward's Grammar School, and was made a borough magistrate in 1856, but was of very unostentatious and retiring habits. He married Mary Auster Balleny, by whom he had five sons and one daughter. He died of paralysis at his residence, Pool Park, Denbighshire, on 22 Sept. 1865.

Elkington showed indomitable energy in introducing, in conjunction with his cousin, Henry Elkington [see below], the industry of electro-plating and electro-gilding. Up to 1840 plated silver goods were made only by rolling or soldering thin sheets of silver upon copper. Wollaston had in 1801 applied the principle of the voltaic pile to the deposition of one metal upon another. Subsequent applications of this principle, by Bessemer (1834), Jacobi (1838), and Spencer of Liverpool (1839) induced the Elkingtons to attempt a practical employment of the method in their trade. In 1836 and 1837 they had taken out patents for 'mercurial gilding;' and a patent of July 1838 first refers to the application of a separate current of electricity. In 1840 John Wright, a Birmingham surgeon, discovered what has since proved to be the best of all liquids for electro-plating —solutions of the cyanides of gold and silver in cyanide of potassium. The Elkingtons took out a patent embodying this process, for which they paid Wright (*d.* 1844) a royalty, and afterwards an annuity to his widow. They also bought a process invented by J. S. Woolrich in August 1842, depending upon Faraday's discovery (1830) of magneto-electricity. In 1842 Josiah Mason [q. v.] became a partner in the firm. The large works in Newhall Street, Birmingham, were completed in 1841, and after a seven years' struggle against the opposition of the older systems, commercial success was attained. The Elkingtons patented their processes in France in 1842, when they were opposed by a M. de Ruolz. A compromise was ultimately made, and the Monthyon Prix of a gold medal and twelve hundred francs divided between De Ruolz and the Elkingtons. In 1881 Sir C. W. Siemens [q. v.], in an address at the Midland Institute, expressed his gratitude to G. R. Elkington for his early and generous encouragement of his improvements. Elkington, with Mason, established large copper-smelting works at Pembrey, South Wales. He was a generous master, and built houses and schools for the persons employed in his business. After his death the business was carried on by his sons.

Henry Elkington (1810–1852), cousin of G. R. Elkington, born in 1810, was the son of John Elkington of Princethorpe, Warwickshire. He was apprenticed to his uncle James, and while so employed invented and patented the pantascopic spectacles. He began to study electro-plating about 1832. He afterwards entered into partnership with his cousin, and was specially useful in the artistic department. He married the sister of G. R. Elkington, and died 26 Oct. 1852. He was buried in the churchyard of Northfield, and a monument was placed in the church. He left one son, who died young.

[Private information from relatives; Times, 5 Dec. 1865; Morning Post, 1862; R. B. Prosser, in Birmingham Weekly Post, 24 July 1880; Journal Society of Arts, 29 Jan. 1864; Bunce's Biography of Josiah Mason (privately printed), 1882; George Gore, in Popular Science Review, April and October 1862; Art Manufactures of Birmingham and Midland Counties in International Exhibition of 1862, by George Wallis; Report by Elkington and De Ruolz in Sturgeon's Ann. of Electricity, 1842; Article by W. Ryland, in Timmins's Birmingham and the Midland Hardware District, 1866; Art of Electro-Metallurgy, by George Gore, 1877; Jurors' Reports, Exhibition of 1851.] W. J. H.

ELLA. [See Ælla.]

ELLA, JOHN (1802–1888), violinist and director of concerts, born at Thirsk 19 Dec. 1802, was intended by his father, Richard Ella, for the law; but his instinct for music was too strong to be resisted, and in 1819 he was taught the violin by M. Fémy, with a view to adopting the musical profession. On 18 Jan. 1821 he made his first appearance as a professional musician in the orchestra of Drury Lane Theatre, 'in preference to quill-driving in an attorney's office,' as he tells us in his 'Musical Sketches.' In the following year he was promoted to the band of the King's Theatre; but it was not until 1826, on the completion of his musical education under Attwood, and subsequently under Fétis in Paris, that he took his place as a member of all the important orchestras of London, such as the Philharmonic, the Ancient Concerts, &c. The Saltoun Club of Instrumentalists and the Società Lirica are said to have been founded by him as early as this period of his life. They were intended for the practice and performance of unfamiliar operatic music. He played in the orchestra on

the occasion of Weber's funeral, 21 June 1826. About this time he was appointed to a subordinate post at the Royal Academy of Music, and became musical editor of the 'Athenæum' and other papers. In 1830 he seems to have given public concerts under the patronage of the Duke of Leinster (*Musical Union Record*). He wrote a 'Victoria March' on the occasion of her majesty's first visit to the city, in November 1837, and this is almost his only experiment as a composer. During his frequent journeys to the continent he made the acquaintance of a large number of foreign musical celebrities, and it is no doubt to this that he owed not merely the catholicity of his taste, but also much of the success of the undertaking with which his name is identified. The set of chamber concerts which he inaugurated, under the name of the 'Musical Union,' and which originated in a weekly meeting at his own house, had a most important effect on the public taste, not so much perhaps directly as through its successor, the Popular Concerts. By the formation of an aristocratic committee, and by making the concerts in some measure social gatherings, for which the privilege of membership could only be obtained by personal introduction, he secured for his scheme a prestige which had been enjoyed by no concerts except the Concerts of Ancient Music. It was infinitely to Ella's credit that under such circumstances the standard of the music performed, and that of the performances, for which he alone was responsible, remained so high as it did throughout the thirty-five years of the Musical Union's existence. The programme always contained at least two concerted instrumental works of a high order, and the compositions chosen showed the director to be marvellously free from narrowness in musical taste. The executants were generally artists of established position, many of whom had not appeared before in England. The annual series consisted of eight afternoon concerts given during the season, at first in Willis's Rooms, and a benefit concert for the director, when vocal music, at other times excluded, was allowed to form part of the programme. Two excellent details of arrangement characterised the concerts, viz. the placing of the artists in the middle of the room, with the audience surrounding them, and the introduction of analytical programmes, not the formidable pamphlets which are now issued under that title, but a few pages of explanatory matter, which were printed and sent out to the subscribers a few days before the concert. The undertaking met with such support that a series of evening concerts, at somewhat lower prices, was started in the early part of 1852, under the title of 'Musical Winter Evenings.' In 1858 both sets of concerts were transferred to Hanover Square Rooms, and in the following year to the newly opened St. James's Hall. In the same year, the Monday Popular Concerts having been set on foot, Ella's evening series was given up. A project for founding a Musical Union Institute, broached in September 1860, was insufficiently supported. Its object was to provide, for the use of musicians, a musical library, a collection of instruments, and rooms for lectures, rehearsals, and concerts, and for a time the institute was advertised as actually existing at Ella's house, 18 Hanover Square. In 1855 he had been appointed musical lecturer to the London Institution, and the substance of three lectures on melody, harmony, and counterpoint was given in the 'Musical Union Record,' i.e. the analytical programme above referred to. Of the many subsequent series delivered by him one only appears to have been published, a set of four on dramatic music (1872). In 1869 he published 'Musical Sketches Abroad and at Home,' a volume of anecdotes, autobiographical and otherwise, bearing on music. The book ran through two editions, and a third, edited by the author's friend, Mr. John Belcher, was published in 1878. A 'Personal Memoir of Meyerbeer, with Analysis of "Les Huguenots,"' is Ella's only important contribution to musical literature besides those we have mentioned. His title of professor was derived from his post at the London Institution. He was honorary member of the Philharmonic Academy of Rome, and of the Philharmonic Society of Paris. The Musical Union ceased to exist in 1880, when the director gave up active work. For the last twenty years of his life he lived at 9 Victoria Square, London, where he died 2 Oct. 1888, after repeated attacks of paralysis. For some years before his death he had been totally blind. He was buried in Brompton cemetery 5 Oct.

[Musical Sketches at Home and Abroad; Musical Union Record, 1845–73; Grove's Dict. of Music, i. 486, ii. 432; obituary notice by Mr. T. L. Southgate in the Musical Standard for 6 Oct. 1888.] J. A. F. M.

ELLACOMBE or ELLICOMBE, HENRY THOMAS (1790–1885), divine and antiquary, son of the Rev. William Ellicombe, rector of Alphington, Devonshire, was born in 1790, and having graduated B.A. from Oriel College, Oxford, in 1812, applied himself until 1816 to the study of engineering in Chatham Dockyard, under the direction of Brunel. In

1816 he proceeded to the degree of M.A., and was ordained for the curacy of Cricklade, a Wiltshire parish in the diocese of Gloucester. In the following year, having received priest's orders, he removed to Bitton, Gloucestershire, in the same diocese. He held the curacy till 1835, when he became the vicar. In 1850 he was presented to the rectory of Clyst St. George, Devonshire, being succeeded in his former benefice by his son, the Rev. Canon Ellacombe. He died at Clyst St. George, 30 July 1885, and was buried in the churchyard of Bitton.

In spite of many difficulties, Ellacombe restored the church of Bitton in 1822, and built three other churches in the wide district under his care. In 1843 his parishioners presented him with a testimonial, and in doing so the churchwardens stated that he had been the means of providing church accommodation in the district for 2,285 worshippers, and schoolrooms for 820 children. After his removal to Clyst St. George he rebuilt the nave of the church, and in 1860 erected a school-house and master's residence.

Ellacombe was the great authority on bells, upon which he wrote some valuable treatises. He likewise invented an ingenious apparatus of chiming hammers, which enables one man to chime all the bells in a steeple. He was a learned antiquary, and a skilful florist and botanist. His chief writings are: 1. 'Practical Remarks on Belfries and Ringers,' Bristol, 1850, 4th edit. 1876. 2. 'The Bells of the Church,' London, 1862. 3. 'History and Antiquities of the Parish of Clyst St. George,' Exeter, 1865. 4. 'Memoir of the Manor of Bitton,' 1867. 5. 'Church Bells of Devon, with a List of those in Cornwall and a Supplement,' Exeter, 1872. 6. 'Church Bells of Somerset,' &c., Exeter, 1875. 7. 'The Voice of the Church Bells,' Exeter, 1875. 8. 'Church Bells of Gloucestershire,' &c., Exeter, 1881. 9. 'History and Antiquities of the Parish of Bitton,' 2 parts, Exeter, 1881–3. These works were privately printed.

[Catalogue of Oxford Graduates (under the name 'Ellicombe'); Church Bells, 7 Aug. 1885; Gloucestershire Notes and Queries, iii. 230; Mozley's Reminiscences, i. 75–81.] B. H. B.

ELLENBOROUGH, Lord and Earl of. [See Law, Edward.]

ELLERKER, Sir RALPH (*d.* 1546), warrior, was the eldest son of Sir Ralph Ellerker of Risby, Yorkshire, by Anne, daughter of Sir Thomas Gower of Stytnam. Both father and son were knighted by the Earl of Surrey at Flodden Field. The elder Ellerker took part in the useless Spanish expedition in 1512, was an esquire of the king's body, received a salary as one of the king's spears of honour, and died in 1540. Whether it was he or his son who represented Scarborough in the parliament of 1529 is uncertain. The younger Ellerker was appointed chief steward of the lordships of Cotingham and Rise in 1522, and from that time onward frequently was on the commission of the peace for the East Riding. He was on the royal commission to treat for redress of outrages in the west marches in 1531, when he also served on a commission for the reform of the weirs and fishgarths in Yorkshire. In 1533 he was busy in the north mustering troops and fighting, and in July of that year he was one of the English commissioners who concluded a year's truce with Scotland. He was returned by York county for the parliament of 1541. In 1542 he was head of a commission appointed to survey the waste grounds on the border, to describe the condition of 'all castells, towers, barmekins, and fortresses,' and to advise on the best means for strengthening the defences and peopling the district. The official report of this commission is preserved among the Harleian MSS. (292, ff. 97–123). In the same year Ellerker was one of the council at Calais, and in 1544 he was marshal of the English army in Boulogne when that town was captured. He distinguished himself by taking the crest from the dauphin of France. He returned to England in January 1545–6, but in April was at Boulogne again, and died there in battle in that month. He was buried in the church of St. Mary at Boulogne. He married Joan, daughter of John or Thomas Arden, by whom he had a son, Ralph, who was high-sheriff in 1529, was knighted by Henry VIII on presenting the ensign won in France, and died 1 Aug. 1550.

[Poulson's Hist. of Holderness, i. 394; Thomas's Historical Notes, i. 117; Brewer's Letters and Papers of Henry VIII (Rolls Ser.) i. 967, ii. 872, 1464, iii. 864, 3076, v. 147, 335, 347, 497.] A. V.

ELLERKER, THOMAS (1738–1795), jesuit, born at Hart, near Hartlepool, Durham, on 21 Sept. 1738, entered the Society of Jesus in 1755, and in due course became a professed father. When the order was suppressed in 1773 he accompanied his fellow jesuits to Liège, and thence emigrated with the community in 1794 to Stonyhurst, Lancashire, where he died on 1 May 1795.

Ellerker, who is described by Dr. Oliver as 'one of the ablest professors of theology that the English province ever produced,' was the author of: 1. 'Tractatus Theologicus de Jure et Justitiâ,' 1767, 4to, pp. 248. In the

library at Stonyhurst. 2. 'Tractatus de Incarnatione.'

[Foley's Records, vii. 223; Oliver's Collectanea S. J. p. 85; Gillow's Bibl. Dict.; De Backer, Bibl. des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus (1869), p. 1719.] T. C.

ELLERTON, EDWARD, D.D. (1770–1851), founder of scholarships, son of Richard Ellerton of Downholm, Yorkshire, was born in 1770; was educated at Richmond School; matriculated at Oxford as a member of University College; and graduated B.A. in 1792, and M.A. in 1795. Ellerton was appointed master of Magdalen College school in 1799; was afterwards elected fellow of the same college, and proceeded B.D. in 1805, and D.D. in 1815. He was appointed to the perpetual curacy of Horspath, Oxfordshire, in 1814, and to the perpetual curacy of Sevenhampton, Gloucestershire, in 1825, resigning the latter charge early in 1851. For some time also he acted as curate to Routh, the president of Magdalen, at Theale near Reading, a chapelry attached to the rectory of Tilehurst. Ellerton was the founder of many scholarships and prizes. In 1825 he established an annual prize of twenty guineas, open to all members of the university of Oxford who had passed examination for their first degree, the prize to be given for the best English essay on some theological subject. In the earlier part of Pusey's career Ellerton was his close friend, and, in conjunction with Pusey and his brother Philip, he founded in 1832 the Pusey and Ellerton scholarships, three in number, which are open to all members of the university, and are of the annual value of 30*l.* each. Magdalen College also, in which Ellerton had for many years been sole tutor, and very frequently bursar, shared in his benefactions. In addition to other gifts, in 1835 he founded an annual exhibition for the best reader of the lessons in the college chapel; in 1849 an annual exhibition for the best scholar among the choristers; and by his will he founded in Magdalen College two annual exhibitions for students in Hebrew. He further established an exhibition for boys educated at Richmond School. Ellerton was a firm supporter of the principles of the Reformation, and in 1845 published a brief polemical treatise on 'The Evils and Dangers of Tractarianism.' He was lecturer in divinity, and senior fellow of Magdalen College, and perpetual delegate of privileges in Oxford University. He died at his curacy of Theale, 26 Dec. 1851.

[Ann. Reg. 1851; Gent. Mag. 1852.] G. B. S.

ELLERTON, JOHN LODGE, formerly John Lodge (1801–1873), amateur musical composer, son of Adam Lodge of Liverpool, was born in 1801, and sent to Rugby, where his proficiency on the pianoforte became conspicuous. He proceeded to Brasenose College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. 4 Dec. 1821, and M.A. 16 April 1828. At Oxford, before taking his M.A. degree, he published some songs and quadrilles. Their success induced Lodge to study music seriously, and he placed himself for two years under the tuition of Terriani at Rome for counterpoint, and gained practice in Italian methods by writing seven Italian operas. A tour in Germany in the company of the Earl of Scarborough was followed in August 1837 by his marriage with the sister of the eighth earl, the Lady Harriet Barbara Manners-Sutton, a widow. Frequent visits to Germany enabled Lodge to study the masters of instrumental music to the best advantage, and no fewer than fifty string quartets and similar pieces are among his published works. His Opus 100, a string quintet, was noticed in the 'Neue Zeitschrift für Musik' of May 1850, as being skilfully constructed, though neither original nor attractive. In the meantime his English opera, 'Domenica,' produced 7 June 1838 at Drury Lane, with Miss Cawse, Miss Rainforth, and Messrs. Barker, Compton, and Fraser in the principal parts, had been severely handled in the London press. The absurdities of the libretto had no doubt something to do with the failure of this work, but even the most favourable of Lodge's critics (in the 'Morning Chronicle' of 8 June), while giving due praise to the pure style of the music, adds that it was wanting in variety, vigour, effect, originality, and dramatic feeling. Alfred Bunn ('The Stage both before and behind the Curtain') wrote: 'Mr. Lodge's opera of "Domenica" won't do; he is a good musician, but not equal to writing for the stage; perhaps he holds himself above it.' No record appears of the publication of this or of his other English opera, 'The Bridal of Triermain,' or of his German opera, 'Lucinda.' More successful was his oratorio, 'Paradise Lost,' published in 1857 with pianoforte score, the selection of passages from Milton being made with discrimination. Lodge had already given proof of his literary taste in his poetical writings. He was an occasional guest of the Madrigal Society in 1840, 1841, and 1843, and wrote many glees, two of which gained prizes (1836 and 1838) at the Catch Club. Of his sixty-five songs and nineteen duets a few only became widely known.

Some of Lodge's instrumental music has been given at the summer resorts in Baden

and on the Rhine. His favourite residence was at Winkel, near Rüdesheim, and he frequented Aix-la-Chapelle and other health resorts. About 1845 he assumed the name of Ellerton. It may be inferred from the records of the Musical Union, of which he was a member from 1847 to 1871, that he spent most of the years between 1851 and 1857, and again from 1860 to 1867, abroad or at Bodsilin, Carnarvonshire. John Ella [q.v.], the director of the Musical Union, testified to his culture and attainments upon announcing Ellerton's election to the committee of the season of 1851. He was a sympathetic supporter of Wagner, who wrote to Liszt from London, 10 May 1855, that he had lately found a warm friend in this Englishman. Ellerton died at Connaught Place, Hyde Park, on 3 January 1873.

The list of his published works includes five symphonies, Op. 120 being entitled 'Wald Symphonie,' four orchestral overtures, two masses, seven anthems, a 'Stabat Mater,' seventeen motetts, thirteen sonatas, eleven trios, forty-four quartets, three quintets for various instruments, &c. Also two volumes of poetry, 'The Bridal of Salerno,' a romance in six cantos, with other poems (1845), and 'The Elixir of Youth,' a legend, and other poems (1864).

[Musical World of January 1873, and other German and English papers; Grove's Dictionary, i. 486; Records of the Madrigal Society and of the Musical Union; Oxford Graduates; Briefwechsel zwischen Wagner und Liszt, i. 71; Foster's Alumni Oxon. (Lodge)]. L. M. M.

ELLESMERE, Baron. [See Egerton, Sir Thomas, 1540?–1617.]

ELLESMERE, Earl of. [See Egerton, Francis, 1800–1857.]

ELLEY, Sir JOHN (*d.* 1839), lieutenant-general, was, according to one statement, a native of Leeds, articled to a London solicitor, who enlisted in the royal horse guards—then better known as the Oxford Blues—for his future advancement in which corps his father found the means. Another, seemingly better authenticated statement, given in 'Biographia Leodiensis,' on the authority of the Rev. John Smithson, incumbent of Headingley, near Leeds, who died in 1835, is that Elley was born in London, where his father kept an eating-house in Furnival's Inn Cellars, Holborn; that he was apprenticed to Mr. John Gelderd of Meanwood Tannery, near Leeds, and was engaged to Anne Gelderd, his master's daughter, and that he attended her funeral at Armley chapel in great grief. Whether this was before or after his enlistment does not appear. Like many other young soldiers, Elley is said to have been very anxious to get out of the service again, but to have been dissuaded therefrom by the Rev. Mr. Smithson. The regimental records show that Elley enlisted in the blues at Leeds 5 Nov. 1789, and that 4 June 1790 he purchased a troop-quartermastership in the regiment, such warrant rank being then obtained by purchase, and on 6 June 1794 a cornetcy. He was acting-adjutant of the four troops of the blues detached to Flanders with the Duke of York, with which he made the campaigns of 1793–5, and was particularly distinguished at the cavalry action at Cateau, 26 April 1794. After his return from the continent he purchased a lieutenancy in the regiment 26 June 1796, and a troop 26 Feb. 1801. He became major 29 Nov. 1804, and lieutenant-colonel 6 March 1808, having purchased every step. He was employed on the staff of General Staveley in the south of England during the invasion alarms of the beginning of the century, and was assistant adjutant-general of cavalry in Spain in 1808–9, when he was present at the affairs of Sahagun, Benevente, &c., and in the retreat to and battle of Corunna. He was appointed to the army in Portugal in the same capacity in 1809 (Gurwood, *Well. Desp.* iii. 337), and made the subsequent campaigns of 1809–14 in the Peninsula and south of France (*ib.* iv. 61, v. 160–2), including the battle of Fuentes de Onoro, the cavalry affair at Llerena (*ib.* v. 595), the battle of Salamanca, where he had two horses killed under him, and received a severe bayonet wound during the charge of Le Marchant's brigade (*ib.* vi. 57, 64), and the battles of Vittoria, Orthez, and Toulouse. As adjutant-general of cavalry he was present at Waterloo, and according to popular accounts of the battle more than one French cuirassier was laid low by him in single combat. He was made K.C.B., and received numerous foreign decorations, including the fourth class of St. George of Russia. He became a major-general in 1819, governor of Galway in 1820, was employed some years on the staff in the south of Ireland, and appointed colonel 17th lancers in 1829. In 1835 he was returned to parliament for Windsor as a staunch supporter of Sir Robert Peel. He became lieutenant-general in 1837. Elley died at his seat, Cholderton Lodge, near Amesbury, Wiltshire, 23 April 1839, and was buried in the Chapel Royal, Windsor. By his will (personalty sworn under 25,000*l.*) he left two sums of 300*l.* each to be expended on mess-plate for his regiment, a sum of 100*l.* to be distributed among decayed householders in Windsor, and six other legacies of 200*l.* to

300*l.* each to various London charities (see *Gent. Mag.* new ser. xii. 660).

[R. V. Taylor's Biog. Leodiensis, p. 375; Gronow's Anecdotes, iii. 86; Cannon's Hist. Rec. 17th Lancers (succession of colonels); Gurwood's Well. Desp.; Narratives of the Peninsular and Waterloo campaigns, various; Gent. Mag. new ser. xi. 430–1, xii. 660.] H. M. C.

ELLICE, EDWARD, the elder (1781–1863), politician, was of an English family which settled in Aberdeenshire about the middle of the seventeenth century. His grandfather established himself as a merchant in New York, and his father, Alexander, taking the English side in the war of independence, removed to Montreal and founded the house of Inglis, Ellice, & Co. He was also managing director of the Hudson's Bay Company, supplied a very large part of the capital with which the whole fur trade was carried on, and established a branch of his firm in London about 1800. Edward, his third son, was born in 1781, and was educated at Winchester. He afterwards studied at Marischal College, Aberdeen, and while there lived in the family of Principal Brown. He matriculated at the university in 1797, and graduated M.A. in 1800, having chiefly studied ancient history, logic, and moral philosophy. He became a clerk in his father's London house, and there acquired his remarkable business habits, and went to Canada in 1803, where he engaged in the fur trade. He happened while in Canada in 1806 to make the first passage in the first steamboat ever launched, the Fulton. In 1805 he became connected with the competing Canadian fur companies, the North-West Company and the X. Y. Company. In this way he was the opponent of the Hudson's Bay Company. In 1820 the colonial secretary, Lord Bathurst, consulted him as to an amalgamation of the companies, which, after a very difficult negotiation, he accomplished 26 March 1821, and on his suggestion an act was passed in 1821 giving the thus constituted Hudson s Bay Company the right of exclusive trade for twenty years. He remained connected with the company till his death, and was then still a deputy-governor. In 1803 he also paid his first visit to the United States, which he repeatedly revisited down to 1859, acquainting himself with the state of politics from time to time. He foresaw for many years the civil war of 1861 and its enormous cost, and deplored the prospect of the conquest of the confederate states. He was, however, so little of a partisan as to entertain impartially Mason, the confederate commissioner, in 1862, and Adams, the United States ambassador, in 1863. Having married in 1809 Lady Hannah Althea Bettesworth, widow of Captain Bettesworth, R.N., and youngest sister of the second Earl Grey, he was thrown into constant contact with the whig party. By her he had one son, Edward [q. v.], afterwards M.P. for the St. Andrews burghs. She died 29 July 1832. He married in 1843 Lady Leicester, widow of the first Earl of Leicester, and third daughter of the fourth Earl of Albemarle. She died in 1844. His views were at first strongly radical, and he was the friend and associate of Sir F. Burdett, Sir J. Cam Hobhouse, and Whitbread; and during his closest alliance with the whig government he was supposed to represent the radical section. He was elected a member of Brooks's Club 3 June 1809, and in 1818, with Peter Moore, defeated Joseph Butterworth and was returned for Coventry. Coventry had an exclusively freeman's franchise, and there being no householder vote as such, a large proportion of the 3,700 voters had to be brought from a distance. The elections were thus enormously costly, but there was no direct bribery. In 1820 he was again returned at the head of the poll. Foreseeing the difficulty of colonial relations with Canada, he supported in 1822 Wilmot's Canadian Government and Trade Bill. He was defeated at Coventry in 1826, but was again successful in 1830. In 1831 he was returned with Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, and continued to represent the town till his death, receiving the second votes of radicals and conservatives, as well as liberal support. He never canvassed, but during elections, or when his votes had given offence, his habit was to address meetings. In general his constituents allowed him much political latitude. During his first three parliaments he was a follower of Joseph Hume. In Lord Grey's government, in spite of Lord Duncannon's claims from his services as whip to the opposition, he was appointed, November 1830, secretary to the treasury and whip—an arduous post, as he had the principal conduct of the election of 1831, was opposed by a very able tory whip, Holmes, and had large funds to administer. 'He beat the enemy with their own weapons,' says Le Marchant; 'he collected large sums from the leading whigs, with which he purchased several of the nomination boroughs previously represented by tories.' Having a great provincial connection with local liberal leaders, he was widely successful. He was not on the committee of four which prepared the first scheme of reform for the approval of the cabinet, but he vigorously supported it in parliament, especially the parts of it which enfranchised the metropolitan boroughs. 'He had more to do,' says Campbell, 'with carrying the bill than any other man' (*Autobiography*, i. 500). In August 1832 he resigned

his secretaryship, and expressed a strong wish never to hold office again. His business affairs called him to America, and his passage was taken, when Lord Grey by a most urgent written entreaty induced him to accept the secretaryship at war with a seat in the cabinet, which he held till Lord Melbourne's resignation in December 1834 (original letter of Earl Grey, dated Downing Street, 27 March 1833). While secretary at war he had urged strongly that appointments in the army should be made directly by the secretary, so as to secure responsibility to parliament; but in this he was steadily opposed by the Duke of Wellington. From 1834 he never held office again, but continued the confidential adviser of liberal governments till his death. His advice in general was for liberals to resign rather than be turned out; and when in opposition, not to be in a hurry to turn out a conservative government. He was influential in forming many ministries, especially Lord Melbourne's second administration. In 1834, while the committee appointed to consider Whittle Harvey's claims to be called to the bar was sitting, he was charged with having employed public funds for election purposes in 1832. The charge, however, was refuted (HANSARD, 21 and 23 July 1834); he had found large sums for the election from his own private fortune upon the failure of party funds (*Greville Memoirs*, 1st ser. iii. 112). In 1836 he was chiefly instrumental in founding the Reform Club, of which he was the first chairman. After the Reform Bill of 1832 he was opposed to further organic change, and condemned Lord John Russell's proposals for further reform. Though he did not agree with Palmerston's foreign policy, especially in 1840, when he and other whigs misled Guizot into supposing that his policy in the East would not be interfered with by England, he supported him as premier. He was intimate with many leading French politicians, especially with Guizot, Thiers, Prosper Mérimée, and Madame de Lieven. In April 1836 he was in Paris, privately urging the French government to send an armed force into Spain, and again in January 1837, after a visit to America, intriguing to set up Thiers against the government of M. Molé (*Raikes's Journal*, ii. 353; *Greville Memoirs*, 3rd ser. iii. 379). In 1855 he was a member of Roebuck's committee to inquire into the administration of the Crimean war; and in 1857 of the Hudson's Bay committee, before which he was also a witness. He was universally known by the nickname, probably invented by Brougham, of 'the Bear'—'for his wiliness,' says Carlyle (CARLYLE, *Reminiscences*, ed. C. Norton, i. 207), 'rather than for any trace of ferocity,' really from his connection with the north-west fur trade. He was a most hospitable and disinterested man, and never sought anything from governments. He declined even the peerage which was the obvious reward of his great party services, and probably the sole acquisition of his political life was the silver inkstand which he retained in accordance with the custom of the time when he gave up the office of secretary at war. Though little of a student, he was well informed, a ready speaker, but not easily stirred to speak, an excellent whip, exempt from the social prejudices of the whigs, popular with the House of Commons, sagacious, and independent. 'Il était,' says P. Mérimée, 'l'un des plus parfaits modèles du gentleman de la vieille roche.' Politics cost him large sacrifices, for he was a busy and successful merchant; the first to pass from the counting-house to the cabinet. He inherited large landed estates in Canada and in the state of New York, and was in early life practically engaged in colonising them. He entertained at Glenquoich in Inverness with a profuse but delightful hospitality, sometimes having more than a thousand guests in a year. He was made a D.C.L. of St. Andrews, and was appointed a deputy-lieutenant of Inverness-shire in 1862. He presided at a public dinner at Inverness held to celebrate the completion of the northern railways on 10 Sept. 1863, and was found dead in his bed at Ardochy, on his estate of Glengarry, from heart disease on 17 Sept., in the following week. He was buried on 23 Sept. at Torr-na-Cairidh, a mound at the end of Loch Garry. His portrait is in the Reform Club.

[Times, 21 Sept. 1863; for his early life Scottish American Journal, 15 Oct. 1863; Greville Memoirs; Raikes's Journal; McCullagh Torrens's Melbourne; Lord Malmesbury's Recollections; Croker Papers; Gent. Mag. 1863; Le Marchant's Lord Althorp; pamphlet, The Hudson's Bay Company: What is it? 1864; Report of the Committee of the House of Commons on the Hudson's Bay Co., 1857; Bryce's Hist. of the Canadian People; Fagan's The Reform Club; Mérimée's Letters to Panizzi and Portraits Historiques, 1874, p. 290; Watkins's Canada.]

J. A. H.

ELLICE, EDWARD, the younger (1810–1880), politician, only son of the Right Hon. Edward Ellice [q. v.], and of his first wife, Lady Hannah Althea Bettesworth, sister of the second Earl Grey, was born in London 19 Aug. 1810. He was educated at Eton and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was admitted M.A., without previous degree, as eldest grandson of Earl Grey (GRACE), 2 May 1831. In 1832 he went to Russia in the

diplomatic service as private secretary to Lord Durham, and in 1838 in the same capacity to Canada. In 1834 he married Catharine Jane, daughter of General Balfour of Balbirnie, who died in 1864. He subsequently married Eliza Stewart, widow of Alexander Speirs of Elderslie, and daughter of T. C. Hagart of Bantaskine. At the general election of 1834 he contested Inverness, and was defeated by a tory candidate, but was elected member for Huddersfield in 1836, and when that parliament was dissolved he stood for St. Andrews burghs, was returned by a majority of twenty-nine, and represented the constituency for forty-two years. Throughout this long career he was a consistent supporter of the liberal politics with which he entered parliament. He supported the abolition of the corn laws and of the navigation laws, and on every occasion maintained the principles of free trade. He gave important aid in the reform of the Scotch poor law and lunacy law, opposed the Maynooth grant, and advocated the disestablishment of the Irish church. In 1855 he published 'The State of the Highlands in 1854,' a pamphlet containing several of his letters to Lord Palmerston on the oppressive method of administering the poor law in the highlands then existing. In 1859 he was attacked in many newspapers (*Daily News*, 24 Jan. 1859) for a proposal that there should be some nominated members in the House of Commons. Having felt a growing want of confidence in Mr. Gladstone, then the leader of the liberal party, he was much astonished when on the morning of 13 Nov. 1869 a letter arrived from that minister, proposing that he should be added to the peerage of the United Kingdom 'as a genuine tribute,' wrote Mr. Gladstone, 'to your character, position, and public services.' He declined the proposed honour. In 1873 he gave long and valuable evidence before a royal commission on the state of the highlands as regards deer, sheep, wire fencing, and the game laws. On 4 Nov. 1879 he published a farewell address to his constituents, and soon after retired from parliament. In the following June he was ill, but his health improved, and he sailed in July for a cruise in his yacht Ita. He died on board off Portland during the night of 2 Aug. 1880, and was buried at Tor-na-cairidh on Lochgarry, Inverness-shire. Early in life he bought with the money left to him by his mother the estate of Glenquoich, Inverness-shire, and some years later he acquired from Lord Ward the adjoining estate of Glengarry. He loved the highlands, and at Invergarry on Loch Oich built a house of extraordinary comfort in a situation which combined all the beauties of mountain, water, and woods. He did all in his power to improve the dwellings of his tenantry, and by planting, fencing, and road-making did much for their comfort. He knew personally every one who lived on his estates, and had great influence with them. When he first went to live at Glenquoich, a freebooter of the Rob Roy type haunted the district, and had a little stronghold on an island in Loch Quoich, which still bears his name. This highlander called on the new proprietor, and sticking his dirk in the table defiantly declared that to be his title to his island. The freebooter soon came to like Ellice, and lived in amity with him till other neighbours, less willing to miss a sheep now and then, stormed the stronghold and placed the highland robber in durance at Fort William. Though Ellice had clear and definite opinions upon all the great political movements of his time, his active political life was engaged chiefly with measures of practical importance, and he consequently occupied a less prominent position as a public man than perhaps might have been his had he chosen party politics for the field of his ambition. His portrait by Richmond is at Invergarry.

[Conolly's Biog. Dict. of Eminent Men of Fife, 1866; Fife Herald, August 1880; Scotsman, August 1880; family papers.] N. M.

ELLICOMBE. [See also ELLACOMBE.]

ELLICOMBE, SIR CHARLES GRENE (1783–1871), general, royal engineers, son of the Rev. William Ellicombe, rector of Alphington, Devonshire, was born in his father's rectory on 3 Aug. 1783, and after receiving his early education at the grammar school at Chudleigh, and at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, obtained a commission as first lieutenant in the royal engineers on 1 July 1801. After a year and a half, during which he was employed on the military works and fortifications of Portsmouth, under Major-general Evelegh, he was sent to Ceylon, and was one of the first batch of British engineers stationed there. At that time the colony was in a very disturbed state, which necessitated active military operations, in which Ellicombe had his full share. He was promoted second captain on 1 July 1806, and returned to England at the end of 1807, where he was employed for a time as second engineer at Chatham, and afterwards as commanding engineer of the northern district of England. On 1 May 1811 he was promoted to the rank of first captain, and in the October following joined the army under Wellington in the Peninsula. In January 1812 he was at the siege of Ciudad Rodrigo, where

he was one of the directors of the attack, and accompanied the column of Vandeleur's brigade to the storming of the breach, left of the main breach. In March and April of the same year he was at the last siege of Badajoz. For his services at this siege he received the brevet rank of major on 27 April, having been recommended by Wellington in his despatch of the 10th of that month. Subsequently he was present in the retreat from Burgos and the crossing of the Ebro. The following year he took part in the battle of Vittoria, serving on the staff as major of brigade, and shortly after was detailed for the siege of San Sebastian, through the whole of which (11 July to 8 Sept. 1813) he acted as brigade-major to the corps of royal engineers. For his exertions in the effectual discharge of this onerous duty and his distinguished conduct he was made a brevet lieutenant-colonel 21 Sept. 1813, and under the order of 1 June 1814 was decorated with the gold medal.

He subsequently fought at the passage of the Bidassoa, and also at the battles of the Nivelle and Nive on 10, 11, and 12 Dec. 1813, concluding his war service by sharing in the campaign of 1814, particularly at the passage of the Adour, blockade of Bayonne, and repulse of the sortie from that fortress. At the cessation of hostilities he joined the headquarters of the army at Toulouse, and in July he returned to England. Some thirty-three years afterwards he was awarded for these distinguished services the war medal and five clasps for Ciudad Rodrigo, Badajoz, Vittoria, Nivelle, and Nive.

On 4 June 1815 he was created one of the first companions of the Bath, and for the next six years held an appointment as commanding engineer in the south of England. In 1821 he was made brigade major of the corps, and as such was on the staff of the inspector-general of fortifications at the ordnance office in London, an appointment corresponding to that of the present deputy adjutant-general, and held by an officer of rank. He was selected for the duty on account of his well-known administrative ability and intimate acquaintance with the large range of complicated details connected with the military and scientific business of the corps of royal engineers, and so well did he fulfil the duties for which his energy, clear mind, and untiring activity singularly fitted him, that he retained the appointment until December 1842, or a period of twenty-two years. He had been promoted major-general in 1841, and rose to the rank of full general and colonel commandant of royal engineers, and on 10 Nov. 1862 was advanced to the honour of a knight commander of the Bath. He married in 1822 a daughter of the Rev. E. Peach, rector of Cheam, Surrey. She died in 1860 without issue. On withdrawing from the active duties of his profession Ellicombe settled at Worthing, where he died on 7 June 1871.

[Official Records; Colburn's United Service Magazine, July 1871.] R. H. V.

ELLICOTT, JOHN (1706 ?–1772), clockmaker and man of science, son of John Ellicott, clockmaker, by Mary, his wife, was born in or about 1706. The elder Ellicott was apprenticed to John Waters 5 Sept. 1687; made free of the Company of Clockmakers 6 July 1696; chosen on the court of assistants of the company 19 Oct. 1726; and elected junior warden 29 Sept. 1731, and renter warden 29 Sept. 1732 (Overall, *Cat. of Library and Museum of Company of Clockmakers*, p. 100, where the Ellicotts, father, son, and grandson, are confused; Atkins and Overall, *Account of the Company of Clockmakers*, p. 87). He died in June 1733, in the parish of Allhallows, London Wall, administration of his goods being granted in P. C. C. on the 25th of that month to his widow, Mary Ellicott. The son, who carried on business at 17 Sweeting's Alley, Royal Exchange (Kent, *London Directory*, 1738, p. 27; Baldwin, *Guide to London*, 1752, p. 151), gained a great reputation for the beauty and excellence of his workmanship, and was appointed clockmaker to George III. Specimens of his art are much prized. He was also a mathematician of considerable ability. In 1736 he submitted to the Royal Society an improved pyrometer, to be again improved upon by Edward Troughton (Nelthropp, *Treatise on Watch-work*, p. 224). It is figured and described in the 'Philosophical Transactions,' xxxix. 297–9, with which cf. 'Gent. Mag.' xx. 119–22. He was elected F.R.S. 26 Oct. 1738 (Thomson, *Hist. of Royal Soc.*, appendix iv.) The following year he read to the society two papers giving 'An Account of the Influence which two Pendulum Clocks were observed to have upon each other' (*Phil. Trans.* vol. xli. pt. i. pp. 126, 128), two editions of which were afterwards published separately, 4to, London, n.d. Another interesting contribution was a series of three 'Essays towards discovering the Laws of Electricity,' read in 1748, and printed in 'Phil. Trans.' xlv. 195, 203, 213; reissued, with the addition of part of a letter from the Abbé Nollet to Martin Folkes (concerning electricity), 4to, London, 1748. In June 1752 he communicated an account of his invention of a compensated pendulum in 'A Description of Two Methods

by which the Irregularities in the Motion of a Clock, arising from the Influence of Heat and Cold upon the Rod of the Pendulum, may be prevented' (*Phil. Trans.* xlvii. 479–494; cf. *Gent. Mag.* xxiii. 429–30); reprinted separately, 4to, London, 1753. It is a bad but very scientific-looking pendulum, and 'is still used in small French clocks made to show and to sell, though it has long ago been abandoned in England' (Beckett, *Rudimentary Treatise on Clocks and Watches and Bells*, 7th edit. pp. 64–5). His other papers are 'On the Specific Gravity of Diamonds' (*Phil. Trans.* xliii. 468–72; cf. *ib.* xlv. 433–4, 453), and 'Experiments in order to discover the Height to which Rockets may be made to ascend and to what Distance their Height may be seen' (*ib.* xlvi. 578–84; cf. Stukeley, *Diaries and Letters*, Surtees Soc., ii. 374). Some observations by Charles Mason for proving the going of Ellicott's clock at St. Helena, accompanied with remarks by James Short, appeared in the 'Phil. Trans.' for 1762 (lii. 534–42; also Stukeley, loc. cit. iii. 466). Ellicott had made a delineation of the complex line of the moon's motion about the same time as James Ferguson, but he at once acknowledged Ferguson's equal title to the scheme (Nichols, *Lit. Anecd.* ii. 423).

By 1761 he had taken a house at Hackney, where he made observations of the transit of Venus (*Gent. Mag.* xxxi. 318). He died suddenly at Hackney in 1772, aged 67 (*Probate Act Book*, P. C. C., 1772; Bromley, *Cat. of Engraved Portraits*, p. 401). In his will dated 18 Oct. 1771, and proved at London 26 March 1772, he described himself as 'of the parish of St. John, Hackney, watchmaker,' and desired burial 'in the same vault with my late dear wife' (registered in P. C. C., 91, Taverner). He left issue two sons, Edward and John, and three unmarried daughters, Deborah, Mary, and Elizabeth. A daughter died at Hackney, aged 50, in May 1790 (*Gent. Mag.* vol. lx. pt. i. p. 477). Ellicott was a nonconformist, and he bequeathed 20*l.* to the pastor (Palmer), and 10*l.* to the poor of the dissenters' meeting-house in Mare Street, Hackney. A mezzotinto three-quarter length portrait of Ellicott, at the age of sixty-seven, engraved by Robert Dunkarton after Nathaniel Dance, was published in 1772, the year of his death. He is represented sitting. A fine impression, presented to the Clockmakers' Company by his grandson, Edward Ellicott, in 1821, is now at the Guildhall (Overall, loc. cit.) Four of his letters to Dr. Thomas Birch, 1752–16, are preserved in the British Museum, Addit. (Birch) MS. 4305, ff. 139–44; another letter dated 1757 is Addit. MS. 28104, f. 36; see also Addit. MS. 6209, f. 217.

Edward Ellicott, the eldest son, having been admitted to partnership about 1769 (Baldwin, *Guide to London*, 1770, p. 113), succeeded to his father's business, and was likewise appointed clockmaker to the king (*Gent. Mag.* xliv. 537, 538). He died in Great Queen Street, London, 3 Feb. 1791 (*ib.* vol. lxi. pt. i. pp. 187, 277, 379). One of his sons, Edward Ellicott, carried on the business at Sweeting's Alley, and became an active member of his company, being elected junior warden in 1828 and 1829, renter warden in 1830–2, senior warden in 1833, and master in 1834, an office he continued to fill until his death 8 July 1836, at the age of sixty-three (Atkins and Overall, p. 89; *Gent. Mag.* new ser. vi. 219).

[Authorities as above; Atkins and Overall's Some Account of the Company of Clockmakers, p. 165; Nouvelle Biographie Générale, xv. 892, where French authorities are cited; Wood's Curiosities of Clocks and Watches, pp. 137, 138, 347; Nelthropp's Treatise on Watch-work, pp. 92, 100, 224.] G. G.

ELLIOT. [See also Eliot, Eliott, and Elliott.]

ELLIOT, ADAM (*d.* 1700), traveller, was, according to his 'Narrative of my Travails, Captivity, and Escape from Salle, in the Kingdom of Fez,' a member of Caius College, Cambridge, from 1664 to 1668, when he took his B.A. degree. This much is certain about him (*Cantabrigienses Graduati*, p. 129), and the charge subsequently brought against him by his fellow-collegian, Titus Oates, of having been compelled to quit the university in consequence of his debauched living, was evidently false. But the rest of his career is obscure. According to his own account, he travelled about the continent for the next two years, and was returning to England in June 1670, when he was taken captive by the Moors and sold as a slave. His description of his captivity and escape is thrilling, but not necessarily true in every detail. In November Elliot reached England, and for the next two years was a private tutor. In December 1672 he was ordained priest by the Bishop of London. He was then chaplain to Lord Grey of Werke, after which he officiated in Dublin, until in 1679 he was summoned to England as witness in a lawsuit arising out of Lord Grey of Werke's will. He was about to return to Ireland when he was apprehended on the evidence of Oates, who accused him of being a jesuit priest, and an apostate to Mahomedanism. Elliot gained his discharge without

being brought to trial, but was reapprehended in Dublin for abusing Oates, and fined 200*l.* In 1682 he brought an action against Oates for defamation of character, and gained 20*l.* damages. Elliot's 'Apologia pro Vitâ Suâ' was published in the same year; it is sarcastically entitled 'A Modest Vindication of Titus Oates the Salamanca Doctor from Perjury,' and contains the 'Narrative' mentioned above, Oates's depositions, and an account of the trial between him and Elliot. It is evidently more ingenious than veracious, and the 'Narrative' was amusingly burlesqued by Bartholomew Lane, a partisan of Oates, in 'A Vindication of Dr. Titus Oates from two Scurrilous Libels' (1683).

[The Modest Vindication mentioned above.]

L. C. S.

ELLIOT, Sir CHARLES (1801–1875), admiral, son of the Right Hon. Hugh Elliot [q.v.], and nephew of Gilbert Elliot, first earl of Minto [q.v.], was born in 1801, probably at Dresden, where his father was then the English minister. He entered the navy in 1815, and in 1816 was midshipman of the Minden at the bombardment of Algiers. After serving in the East Indies and on the coast of Africa, he was made lieutenant on 11 June 1822, and served in that capacity in the Hussar on the Jamaica station. In April 1826 he was promoted to be commander of the hospital ship at Port Royal, and was advanced to post rank on 28 Aug. 1828. From that time he virtually retired from the navy, being actively and almost continuously employed in the service of the foreign or colonial office. From 1830 to 1833 he was protector of slaves in Guiana. In 1834, when commissioners were appointed to superintend affairs of trade in China, Elliot accompanied them as secretary, and in 1837 became chief superintendent and plenipotentiary. It was just at this time that the Chinese decided on putting a stop to the opium traffic, always illegal; but as the English merchants found it too lucrative readily to give up, smuggling to an enormous extent still continued. Elliot had from the first seen that these conflicting determinations must lead to serious disturbance, and as early as November 1837 had written home advising that a special commission should be sent out to arrange the business. The home government neglected to do this or to send any special instructions. The smuggling went on briskly; the Chinese authorities grew more and more determined, and at last, with threats of violence which there were no means of resisting, demanded that all the opium on the coast should be delivered up to be destroyed. As the only possible means of preventing a general massacre, Elliot ordered the ships to comply with the demand, and opium to the value of upwards of four millions sterling was accordingly surrendered and burnt. All trade was meantime prohibited, and the death of a Chinaman, slain in a casual fight with some English sailors, made a further ground of quarrel. Not only was trade prohibited, but the Chinese were forbidden to bring supplies of any kind to the resident English. This stoppage of supplies was strictly enforced by some war junks, and Elliot, strengthened by the arrival of the Volage frigate, gave orders for these to be dispersed; at the same time he declared the port and river of Canton to be in a state of blockade. In January 1840 active hostilities began, virtually under the direction of Elliot, acting in his civil capacity and in concert with his cousin, Rear-admiral George Elliot [q. v.], and afterwards with Sir James John Gordon Bremer [q. v.], by whom the Bogue forts, commanding the passage of the Canton river, were taken and destroyed; after which Elliot was able to conclude a preliminary treaty with the Chinese local authorities. By both governments was this treaty disavowed. The war began afresh, and the troops were on the point of storming Canton, when Elliot, interposing, admitted it to a ransom of 1,250,000*l.* It was his last action as agent in China, Mr. Pottinger arriving to supersede him.

Elliot was afterwards chargé d'affaires in Texas 1842–6, governor of Bermuda 1846–54, of Trinidad 1854–6, and of St. Helena 1863–9. In 1856 he was nominated a civil K.C.B. His naval promotions during this time were merely honorary, on the retired list; he became rear-admiral 2 May 1855, vice-admiral 15 Jan. 1862, and admiral 12 Sept. 1865. He died at Witteycombe, Exeter, on 9 Sept. 1875.

[O'Byrne's Nav. Biog. Dict.; Times, 15 Sept. 1875; Walpole's Hist. of England, v. 290.]

J. K. L.

ELLIOT, Sir GEORGE (1784–1863), admiral, second son of Gilbert Elliot, first earl of Minto [q. v.], was born on 1 Aug. 1784, and entered the navy in 1794 on board the St. George with Captain Foley, whom he successively followed to the Britannia, Goliath, and Elephant. He was thus, as a youngster, present in both of Hotham's actions off Toulon, in the battle of Cape St. Vincent, and in that of the Nile [see Foley, Sir Thomas]. He was promoted to be lieutenant on 12 Aug. 1800, and in 1801 served in the San Josef and St. George, under Lord Nelson's flag, though not having any imme-

diate part in the battle of Copenhagen. In April 1802 he was promoted to be commander, and in May 1803 went out to the Mediterranean as a volunteer with Nelson in the Victory. On 10 July Nelson appointed him to the Termagant sloop, and on 1 Aug. posted him to the Maidstone frigate, though owing to some irregularity the commission was not confirmed till 2 Jan. 1804 (*Nelson Despatches*, v. 150, 184). He was shortly afterwards attached to the squadron off Cadiz, under Sir Richard Strachan, at which time Nelson, in writing to Lord Minto, said: 'I assure you, on my word of honour, that George Elliot is at this moment one of the very best officers in our service, and his ship is in high order' (*ib.* v. 365). During the war Elliot continued actively employed on the home station, in the Mediterranean and the East Indies; at the reduction of Java in August 1811, and in the suppression of the Borneo pirates in June 1813. From 1827 to 1830 he commanded the Victory guardship at Portsmouth, and in September 1830 was nominated a C.B., and on 10 Jan. 1837 was advanced to flag rank. He was secretary of the admiralty from December 1834 to April 1835, and one of the lords commissioners from that time till, in September 1837, he was appointed to the command-in-chief at the Cape of Good Hope. This he held till February 1840, when he was sent on to China, to be at once commander-in-chief and joint plenipotentiary with Captain Charles Elliot [q. v.] His health, however, gave way, and in November he was compelled to invalid. He had no further service, but became, in course of seniority, vice-admiral on 13 May 1847, and admiral on 5 March 1853; in November 1862 he was made a K.C.B. He had long been in delicate health, and after a protracted illness, died in London on 24 June 1863.

He married, in 1810, Eliza Cecilia, daughter of Mr. James Ness of Osgodvie in Yorkshire, and had a numerous family; his eldest son is the present Admiral Sir George Elliot, K.C.B.

[O'Byrne's Nav. Biog. Dict.; Times, 25 June 1863; Nicolas's Nelson Despatches, freq. (see Index at end of vol. vii.)] J. K. L.

ELLIOT, Sir GILBERT, Lord Minto (1651–1718), judge, of the family of Eliot of Craigend, was born in 1651, being the eldest son of Gavin Eliot of Midlem Hill, Roxburghshire. For many years he practised successfully as a writer in Edinburgh. In 1679, when William Veitch, the covenanting minister, who afterwards remained his lifelong friend, was arrested and tried for his nonconformity, Eliot was his agent, and went specially to Lord Shaftesbury to protest against the illegality of the proceedings against Veitch. He succeeded in procuring a royal order to stay the proceedings against Veitch, and thus became well thought of by the whig leaders. While the Earl of Argyll lay in prison he acted for him, and by great promptitude secured his escape before sentence was pronounced upon him. He became deeply implicated in the subsequent plots against James, went over to Holland to prepare for the Earl of Argyll's rising, acted as clerk to the council which the rebels held at Rotterdam, collected funds among the churches of Geneva and Germany for a rising in Scotland, and, returning to Scotland, was actually in arms with the earl. He escaped by flight, but was convicted and suffered forfeiture before the justices on 17 March, and was condemned to death by the court of justiciary on 16 July 1685 (*Acts Scots Parl.* viii. 342, 490, xi. 259, 462; Fountainhall, *Decisions*, i. 366; Wodrow, *Sufferings of Church of Scotland*, iv. 230). Having obtained the royal pardon he applied on 8 Nov. 1687 for admission to the Faculty of Advocates, but failing to pass the required examination, he attempted it again with success on 14 July 1688, and was admitted advocate on 22 Nov. following. Having been active in the Prince of Orange's party, and a member of the deputation from Scotland which invited him to land in England, his forfeiture was rescinded by act of parliament on 22 July 1690, and in 1692 he was knighted and appointed clerk to the privy council. He now enjoyed a large practice, and, though a member, was allowed to plead before parliament (Fountainhall, *Decisions*, i. 475; *Notes*, 230). He was created a baronet in 1700 and a judge of the court of session, in succession to Lord Phesdo, with the title of Lord Minto, on 28 June 1705, and was also a member of the court of justiciary. From 1703 he represented in parliament the county of Roxburgh, and his return was petitioned against in 1710. He was a commissioner of supply in several years from 1696, and opposed the abolition of the separate Scots parliament. He died on 1 May 1718. He was twice married: first, to Helen Stephenson, by whom he had one daughter, and, secondly, to Jean, daughter of Sir Andrew Carre, by whom he had one son, Gilbert (1693–1766), who is separately noticed.

[Brunton and Haig's Senators, p. 480; Burton's Hist. of Scotland; Acts Scots Parl.; Veitch's Memoirs, p. 99; Luttrell's Diary; Carstares State Papers, 625; Life and Letters of Sir Gilbert Elliot, First Earl of Minto, from 1715 to 1806, edited by the Countess of Minto, 1874.] J. A. H.

ELLIOT, Sir GILBERT, Lord Minto (1693–1766), Scotch judge, only son of Gilbert Elliot, lord Minto (1651–1718), by Jean Carre of Cavers, his second wife, was born in 1693 or 1694. He studied law and was admitted advocate on 26 July 1715. On his father's death in 1718 he succeeded him as second baronet. In 1722 he was elected M.P. for Roxburghshire. He represented that county till 1726, when he was raised to the bench, on the death of Sir Francis Grant of Cullen. Following his father's example, he assumed the courtesy title of Lord Minto. He was named a lord of justiciary on 13 Sept. 1733 in succession to Sir William Calderwood of Polton, and succeeded Charles Erskine of Tinwald as justice clerk on 3 May 1763. He held both these offices at the time of his death, which took place somewhat suddenly at Minto on 16 April 1766.

Elliot was not specially eminent as a judge, but he was widely known and had great influence in his own day. He was an accomplished man, extremely well versed in Italian literature, and an excellent musician. He is said to have first introduced the German flute to Scotland, a doubtful statement also made about his son Gilbert. He was an eager agriculturist, and was one of the members of an Edinburgh 'committee of taste for the improvement of the town.' He was instrumental in introducing many improvements into the county of Roxburgh, and the noble trees that still shade the glens at Minto were planted by him. He was an eager supporter of the Hanoverian succession. During the rising of 1745 a party of the highlanders on the march to England suddenly appeared before the house. His daughter Jean (1727?–1805, authoress of the 'Flowers of the Forest') with great presence of mind rushed to meet the visitors and treated them as welcome guests, while Elliot betook himself in all haste to some near craigs, where he lay concealed among the brushwood. The rebels, satisfied with their hospitable reception, departed without inquiring too carefully after Elliot, who used to say that 'he owed his life' on this occasion to his daughter, a reflection which is somewhat of an unfounded libel on the highlanders.

Elliot married Helen Stewart of Allanbank, by whom he had a large family of sons and daughters. Of these several attained distinction. Gilbert [q. v.] and Jane [q. v.] were eminent in literature. John [q. v.] was the sailor who destroyed Thurot's expedition (28 Feb. 1760). Andrew was the last English governor of New York. He used to tell a story, slight in itself, but characteristic of the time and of his father. Andrew when a boy objected to the boiled mutton which seems to have been the eternal Scotch dinner dish of the period. The judge heard the complaint almost with horror, and ordered the servant to give the lad boiled mutton for breakfast, dinner, and supper till he learned to like it.

[Brunton and Haig's Senators of the College of Justice, p. 500; Lady Minto's Life and Letters of First Earl of Minto (1874), vol. i., Introduction; Anderson's Scottish Nation, ii. 132; Foster's Collectanea Genealogica; Members of Parliament, Scotland; Scots Mag. April 1766, p. 223.] F. W–T.

ELLIOT, Sir GILBERT, third baronet of Minto (1722–1777), statesman, philosopher, and poet, son of Sir Gilbert Elliot, second baronet and lord of session (1693–1766) [q.v.], by Helen, daughter of Sir Robert Stuart, baronet, of Allanbank, and a brother of Jane Elliot [q. v.], was born in September 1722, and after attending Dalkeith grammar school entered the university of Edinburgh and subsequently studied at Leyden. Dr. Thomas Somerville, who was minister of Minto parish, mentions that he was 'a distinguished classical scholar' (*Own Life and Times*, p. 120), and he himself states that he 'had read over almost all the classics, both Greek and Latin' (Letter to Hume, 19 Feb. 1751, in Burton's *Life*, i. 326). He was called to the Scotch bar 18 Dec. 1742. His profession proved uncongenial to him (Letter to Baron Mure, 28 June 1742, in *Caldwell Papers*, ii. 28). He was appointed the first sheriff-substitute of Roxburghshire, probably through his father's influence. In 1754 he entered parliament as member for Selkirkshire, and he was again chosen for the same county in 1762, but in 1765 he exchanged it for his native county of Roxburgh, which he continued to represent till his death. In 1756 he was named lord of the admiralty, in 1762 treasurer of the chambers, in 1767 keeper of the signet in Scotland, and in 1770 treasurer of the navy. On the death of his father in 1766 he succeeded him in the baronetcy. Horace Walpole characterised Sir Gilbert Elliot as 'one of the ablest members of the House of Commons.' The testimony as to his oratorical gifts, though coloured by national partiality, is undeniable. Robertson the historian told Somerville that no one in the house excelled him in 'acuteness of reasoning and practical information,' and Boswell quotes his elocution as a model for Scotch orators. He particularly distinguished himself in the debate on the proposed extension of the militia to Scotland in 1751, and in the discussions on the expulsion of Wilkes from the House of Commons in 1769. At first he was a supporter of the party of Pitt and the Grenvilles,

but afterwards he became an adherent of the party of Lord Bute, whom he endeavoured unsuccessfully to reconcile with Pitt. Latterly he became the special confidant of George III, and if not his adviser and mentor in his political policy, the chief advocate of that policy. On the occasion of the London riots in 1771 he appeared in the House of Commons as the king's special ambassador, and, by an inflammatory speech in regard to the threatened liberties of the house, virtually overruled North and carried a decision to which North was opposed, but to which he could not object. He supported the king in his unhappy policy towards America. When in 1775 a conciliatory motion was introduced to allow the colonies to tax themselves, Elliot, by bringing the royal influence to bear on the Bedford party, secured a large majority against the motion.

Elliot continued to retain his interest in literature and philosophy, and not only enjoyed the acquaintance of the principal literary celebrities of the day in London, but numbered among his special friends the leading members of the literary circle in Edinburgh. He was one of the original members of the Poker Club, instituted in Edinburgh in 1762. Home submitted to him his manuscript of the tragedy of 'Douglas,' Robertson of his 'History of Charles V,' and Hume of his 'Dialogues of Natural Religion.' For these 'Dialogues,' which were written in 1751, Hume wished Elliot to assist him in the part of Cleanthes, which represented to a great extent Elliot's philosophical position. This he declined to do, and on returning the papers wrote a long criticism on the 'Dialogues,' and also of Hume's general theory of impressions and ideas, the rough draft of which was published by Professor Dugald Stewart in the notes to his 'Preliminary Dissertation on the Progress of Philosophy,' contributed to the 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' with the remark that 'this careless fragment exhibits an interesting specimen of the progress made in Scotland among the higher classes seventy years ago, not only in sound philosophy but in purity of style.' It was chiefly on account of Elliot's advice that Hume refrained from publishing the 'Dialogues' during his lifetime. Somerville states that Elliot showed a 'marked disapprobation of the sceptical philosophy.' He was an elder of the kirk of Scotland and a member of the general assembly, though on friendly terms with sceptics. Hume and Baron Mure shared throughout life his special intimacy. In 1764 Hume applied to Elliot to use his influence to secure for him the proper credentials and appointments of secretary to the embassy in Paris. In 1764 he consulted Hume regarding the education of his sons there, who, besides selecting for them a suitable academy, was accustomed to visit them regularly, and write their father detailed accounts of their welfare and progress. Horace Walpole made use of the journal of Elliot in his 'Memoirs of George III.' Elliot is said to have left a manuscript volume of poems, but only a few of his verses have been published. He is sometimes wrongly credited with the authorship of the song 'Shepherd Adonis,' which appeared in Ramsay's 'Tea Table Miscellany' in 1724, when he was only two years of age. Equally erroneous is of course also the statement that he was the first to introduce the German flute into his country in 1725, a remark that has also been made about his father. His fame as a song-writer rests upon 'Amynta,' beginning,

My sheep I neglected, I broke my sheep hook,

styled by Sir Walter Scott 'the beautiful pastoral song.' It was printed in the first volume of Yair's 'Charmer,' 1749. In vol. ii. of Johnson's 'Scots Musical Museum' it was, by a mistake of the printer, published under the title 'My Apron Dearie,' that being the name of the tune to which it was set. Elliot's verses on Colonel Gardiner, killed at Prestonpans in 1745, ''Twas at the Hour of Dark Midnight,' were printed in vol. iii. of Johnson's 'Scots Musical Museum' to the tune of 'Sawnie's Pipe.' The 'Fanny' of the song was Colonel Gardiner's daughter Richmond, authoress of 'Anna and Edgar, or Love and Ambition, a Tale,' Edinburgh, 1781. Some stanzas entitled 'Thoughts occasioned by the Funeral of the Earl and Countess of Sutherland in Holyrood House,' published in 'Scots Magazine' 28 Oct. 1766, with the editorial note, 'composed we believe by a person of distinction,' were republished in 'Censura Literaria,' vol. viii., where they are attributed by Sir Edward Bridges to Sir Gilbert Elliot. On account of declining health Elliot went to reside at Marseilles, where he died 11 Jan. 1777. He married in 1746 Agnes, daughter and heiress of Hugh Dalrymple, second son of the first baronet of Hailes, who assumed the additional names of Melgund and Kinnynmound on succeeding to the estates of Melgund in Forfarshire and Kinnynmound in Fife. A sprightly letter of Lady Elliot to Hume is published in Burton's 'Life of Hume' (ii. 446–8). He had six children. His eldest son, Gilbert, first earl of Minto, and his second, Hugh, are separately noticed.

[Life of Gilbert, first earl of Minto, by the Countess of Minto; Burton's Life of Hume; Caldwell Papers (Bannatyne Club); Horace Wal-

pole's Letters; Stenhouse's notes to Johnson's Scots Musical Museum; Somerville's Own Life and Times; Jesse's Reign of George III.]

T. F. H.

ELLIOT, Sir GILBERT, first Earl of Minto (1751–1814), governor-general of India, eldest son of Sir Gilbert Elliot, third baronet, of Minto, in Roxburghshire (1722–1777) [q.v.], by Agnes, daughter of Hugh Dalrymple Murray Kynynmound, was born on 23 April 1751, and was educated first under a private tutor, and afterwards (1764–1766) at the Pension Militaire, Fontainebleau, where he was a schoolfellow of Mirabeau, David Hume, then at Paris, acting as his guardian. The winters of 1766 and 1767 he spent in Edinburgh, attending the lectures on civil law, moral and natural philosophy, humanity, history, and rhetoric. In 1768 he entered Christ Church, Oxford, as a gentleman commoner. Here he seems to have chiefly occupied himself with sport and society. Part of 1770 he spent in Paris, where he attracted the notice of Madame du Deffand and other celebrities, and the vacation of 1773 on the Rhine. In 1769 he had entered Lincoln's Inn, and on 4 May 1774 he was called to the bar. He went the northern circuit, and soon obtained a certain amount of practice. In 1776 he was returned to parliament for Morpeth. Though a whig, he was in favour of the prosecution of the American war, and therefore gave a general support to the government. By 1782, however, he had become convinced that the revolt could no longer be suppressed, and went over to the opposition. About this time he made the acquaintance, which afterwards ripened into friendship, of Burke. Towards the end of the year he was compelled by symptoms of pulmonary disease to leave England for Nice, where he wintered, returning to England completely reinstated in health in the following summer. On his return to London he renewed his acquaintance with Mirabeau, then staying in England, whom he entertained at Bath and Minto. Having on the dissolution of parliament (25 March 1784) lost his seat, he occupied his leisure in preparing, in concert with Burke, the case against Warren Hastings and Sir Elijah Impey. In September 1786 he was returned to parliament for Berwick. On 8 Feb. 1787 he gave notice of motion on the subject of Impey's conduct while chief justice of Fort William. The motion, however, did not come on until 12 Dec. Elliot then in an eloquent speech opened the case against Sir Elijah Impey [q.v.], charging him with perversion of justice in various instances, and particularly in the case of Maharaja Nuncomar, whom he had sentenced to death for forgery. His motion that his complaint against Sir Elijah Impey be received and laid on the table was carried. The proceedings were protracted until 7 May 1788, when Elliot made a second elaborate speech on the question, being supported by Burke. The debate was adjourned and reopened by Elliot the next day. At the close of an animated discussion the motion was lost by 55 to 73. The case against Impey has recently been subjected to careful examination by Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, in two remarkably able volumes, entitled 'The Story of Nuncomar and the Impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey,' in which it is conclusively proved that there was not a tittle of evidence to support the charges 'insinuated rather than alleged' by Elliot. His attack on Impey raised the reputation of Elliot with his party so high that he was put forward on two occasions as a candidate for the speakership, first on 5 Jan. 1789 against Grenville, and secondly on 9 June following against Addington. On both occasions he was beaten. At the general election of 1790 he was returned for Helston, Cornwall. On 10 May 1791 he moved the repeal of the Test Act, so far as it applied to Scotland, but the motion was lost. On the outbreak of the French revolution Elliot declared energetically against the policy of Fox, and exerted himself to detach Lord Portland from the influence of that statesman. On 5 July 1793 he received the degree of D.C.L. from the university of Oxford. In the following September he was appointed civil commissioner at Toulon, where he arrived about the middle of November, and at once opened his commission. By the 20th of the following month, however, Toulon had ceased to be in the possession of the English. Elliot then proceeded to Florence, where he made arrangements for the relief of the refugees from Toulon, and endeavoured to animate the Italian states to a more vigorous resistance to the French. It was now decided, with the consent of the inhabitants, to assume the protectorate of Corsica. Elliot on 19 June 1794 assumed provisionally viceregal powers, though he did not receive his commission from the British government until 1 Oct. He governed constitutionally, opening the parliament of the island on 25 Nov. 1795. By making Pozzo di Borgo president of the council of state, he alienated General Paoli, who conspired for the expulsion of the British from the island, but was himself expelled by Elliot. Elliot's policy was to make Corsica the centre of British influence in the Mediterranean, and his commission invested him with a general control over the movements of the fleet. It was by his direction that Nelson in July 1796 seized the harbour

and forts of Porto Ferraio in the isle of Elba, by way of counterpoise to the recent occupation of Leghorn by the French. In September, however, he received from the Duke of Portland a despatch directing him to withdraw from Corsica, and he accordingly evacuated the island on 26 Oct., and betook himself to Naples, where he met with a splendid reception from the court. Here he remained until 15 Jan. 1797, when he sailed for England, where he landed on 15 March 1798. In the following October he was raised to the peerage by the title of Baron Minto of Minto, in the county of Roxburgh. On 19 March 1799 he delivered in the House of Lords a weighty speech on the union with Ireland, which he supported mainly on the ground that it afforded the only means of effectually controlling the mutual animosities of catholic and protestant. In the following June he was appointed envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at the court of Vienna, where his strenuous efforts to infuse energy into the conduct of the war with France were unsuccessful. He obtained, indeed, on 20 June 1800 the conclusion of a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, by which the emperor engaged, in consideration of a subsidy of 2,000,000*l*., not to make peace without the consent of his Britannic majesty. This treaty, however, was broken by the treaty of Lunéville on 9 Feb. 1801, and Elliot accordingly was recalled. He arrived in London at the end of November 1801. In February 1803 he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society and also of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. On the formation of the whig ministry in 1806 Elliot received the office of president of the board of control, and was soon after appointed governor-general of India. He sailed from England early in February, and reached Calcutta at the end of July 1807. He found the company's finances in considerable disorder, but by careful management soon converted a deficit into a surplus, and that without resorting to cheeseparing economy. He recognised the importance of respecting the religious views of the natives, and accordingly soon after his arrival established a censorship of the missionary press at the Danish settlement of Serampore, which had long been a source of danger to the state by reason of the scurrilous libels upon the Mahommedan faith and Hindu mythology which issued from it. He also prohibited for a time the practice of employing native converts in preaching work. These judicious measures raised a vehement outcry in England that the governor-general was suppressing the propagation of the christian religion in India, which was entirely unjustified by the facts. In 1808 it became necessary to take measures for establishing order in the recently annexed province of Bundelkhand, which had fallen into a state of complete anarchy. The country was mountainous, and the reduction of the fastnesses in which the robber chieftains who infested it had established themselves cost several campaigns and a considerable expenditure of treasure. The work was, however, successfully completed in 1813. Elliot also found it necessary to despatch a force against Abd-ul-samad Khan, a military adventurer who had possessed himself of Hariana. This expedition was brought to a successful conclusion in 1809. In order to provide for the defence of the peninsula against an anticipated invasion by the French by way of Persia and Afghanistan, Elliot despatched in 1808 three missions to Persia, Lahore, and Cabul respectively, with the view of establishing offensive alliances with those states. The mission to Persia failed by reason of the hectoring tone adopted by the envoy, Colonel Malcolm; that to Lahore, which was managed with the utmost tact by Charles (afterwards Sir Charles) Metcalfe, also failed of its original object, the Raja Ranjit Sing being more occupied with his designs against the Sikhs than with fears of a French invasion. Metcalfe, however, compelled him to sign a treaty ceding his recent acquisitions between the Jumna and the Setlej to the company (25 April 1809). For the mission to Cabul Elliot selected Mountstuart Elphinstone, who on 19 April 1809 concluded a treaty (ratified at Calcutta on 17 June) with Shah Shuja, by which, in consideration of a subsidy, that potentate agreed to resist the advance of any French and Persian force, and to exclude all Frenchmen from his country for ever. This treaty, however, was almost immediately rendered nugatory by the expulsion of Shah Shuja from Cabul by Shah Mahommed. Negotiations were also entered into with Scinde the same year, which ultimately resulted in the conclusion of a treaty of general amity with the ameer of that country and the admission of a resident. The suppression of the dakoits, who for years had infested Lower Bengal, of the pirates of the Persian Gulf, of a mutiny at Madras, and the defence of Berar against a formidable irruption of Pathans under Amir Khan also occupied Elliot's attention during this year. In September he sent a small expedition to Macao to protect that port against the French; but the Chinese declining such protection it was withdrawn. About the same time he annexed the island of Amboyna, and the entire group of the Molucca islands in the following spring.

Towards the end of this year (1810) he wrested the isle of Bourbon and the Mauritius from France, and in the spring of 1811 annexed Java, accompanying the expedition himself. For these services he received the thanks of parliament. He returned to Calcutta towards the end of 1811. Attempts were made from time to time during Elliot's administration to compel the Nawab of Oude to introduce reforms into the oppressive fiscal system of that state, but without success; more energetic steps would probably have been taken to that end had he continued longer in office. He was, however, suddenly superseded in 1813, in order that a place might be found for Lord Moira, a personal friend of the regent. Elliot was at the same time created Viscount Melgund and Earl of Minto (24 Feb. 1813). Lord Moira arrived in October, and Elliot at once left for England, where he arrived in May 1814. His term of office was marked by a substantial advance in the material prosperity of India, as well as by a considerable extension and consolidation of the power of the company. He had long contemplated the introduction of reforms into the legal system, with the object of securing greater efficiency and despatch; but no substantial step was taken in this direction during his administration. Himself a man of considerable and varied literary culture, he took the liveliest interest in the development of education in India, and projected the establishment of colleges for the Mahommedans at Bhangulpore, Juanpore, and elsewhere, and the reform of the Madrissa or Mahommedan college of Calcutta, and the extension of the curriculum of the college of Fort William, of which he was *ex officio* visitor. Elliot's strength, which had shown symptoms of decay during the last few years of his viceroyalty, was severely tried by the fatigues incident to the expedition to Java, and soon after his return to England it entirely broke down. He died at Stevenage, while on his way to Minto, on 21 June 1814, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. Elliot married, on 3 Jan. 1777, Anna Maria, eldest daughter of Sir George Amyand, by whom he had three sons and three daughters. His eldest son, Gilbert, and second son, Admiral Sir George, are separately noticed.

Elliot's speeches in parliament are usually reported at considerable length in Hansard. For his speech to the parliament of Corsica, on opening the session of 1795, see 'Il grazioso Discorso pronunziato da Sua Eccellenza il Vice-re del Regno di Corsica all' Apertura della Camera di Parlamento in Corte li 25 Novembre 1795,' Corte, 4to. His speech on the union with Ireland was also printed and circulated in the shape of a pamphlet, under the title 'The Speech of Lord Minto in the House of Peers, 11 April 1799, on a motion for an address to his Majesty to communicate the resolutions of the two Houses of Parliament respecting an Union between Great Britain and Ireland,' London, 1799, 8vo, and elicited two replies, one from the Right Hon. Patrick Duigenan in 'A Fair Representation of the present Political State of Ireland, in a course of Strictures on two pamphlets,' &c., London, 1799; the other, 'An Examination into the Principles contained in a pamphlet entitled the Speech of Lord Minto, &c. By the Right Hon. Barry, Earl Farnham,' Dublin, 1800, 8vo, 2nd edit. An address given by Elliot on 15 Sept. 1810, in his capacity of visitor of the college of Fort William, will be found in 'Public Disputation of the Students of the College of Fort William in Bengal, before the Right Hon. Lord Minto, Governor-general of Bengal, and Visitor of the College, together with his Lordship's Discourse,' Calcutta, 1811, 8vo.

[Life and Letters of Sir Gilbert Elliot, first Earl of Minto, from 1751 to 1806 . . . edited by his great-niece, the Countess of Minto, London, 1874, 8vo, 3 vols.; Lord Minto in India; Life and Letters of Gilbert Elliot, first Earl of Minto, from 1807 to 14, edited by his great-niece, the Countess of Minto, London, 1880, 8vo; Parl. Hist. xix–xxix, xxxiv; Wilson's Hist. of British India, vol. i.; Gent. Mag. (1814), part ii. 393; Brit. Mus. Cat.] J. M. R.

ELLIOT, GILBERT, second Earl of Minto (1782–1859), eldest son of Gilbert Elliot, first earl [q. v.], by his wife Anna Maria, daughter of Sir George Amyand, bart., was born at Lyons on 16 Nov. 1782. He was educated at Edinburgh University and was afterwards trained for the diplomatic service, without, however, any immediate object. In 1806 he was elected member of parliament for Ashburton, Devonshire, which he continued to represent till March 1814, when, on the death of his father, he took his seat in the House of Lords. He had allied himself with the whig party, and on the formation of Lord Grey's ministry was appointed a privy councillor. In August 1832 he went as British ambassador to Berlin, where he remained for two years. His tenure of office had been uneventful, but he was rewarded on his return with the G.C.B. On the appointment of Lord Auckland as governor-general of India, Minto succeeded to his post as first lord of the admiralty in September 1835, and continued to preside over naval affairs till the dissolution of Lord Melbourne's second administration in 1841. It was said at the time that his period of office was dis-

tinguished only by the outcry raised at the number of Elliots who found places in the naval service. In Lord John Russell's cabinet of 1846 Minto (whose daughter Russell had married) became lord privy seal, and in the autumn of the following year he was despatched on a diplomatic mission to Italy to ingratiate Sardinia and Tuscany, to assist in the carrying out of the reforms suggested by Pius IX on his accession to the papacy, and generally to report to the home government on Italian affairs. Partly owing, no doubt, to the French revolution of 1848, the tour was an acknowledged failure so far as any practical result was concerned, excepting that he induced the King of Naples to grant the Sicilians a separate parliament (Malmesbury, *Memoirs*, ed. 1885, p. 127); though it was alleged by the papal authorities that Minto had given them to understand that the English government would be favourable to the parcelling out of England into Roman catholic episcopal sees. On his return Minto resumed his ministerial duties till the resignation in 1852 of Lord John Russell, when he finally left office. He continued to sit and vote in the House of Lords, but otherwise took no part in politics. He died, after a long illness, on 31 July 1859, aged 76. He was an indifferent speaker and was undistinguished by administrative capacity, but he possessed considerable influence in affairs of state. He was a fellow of the Royal Society, an elder brother of Trinity House, and deputy-lieutenant for Roxburghshire. He assumed by royal license the additional surnames of Murray and Kynynmound. He married, on 28 Aug. 1806, Mary, eldest daughter of Patrick Brydone of Coldstream, Berwickshire, and by her, who died at Nervi, near Genoa, on 21 July 1853, he was the father of five sons and four daughters. His eldest son, William Hugh, succeeded to his titles.

[Anderson's Scottish Nation, ii. 132; Gent. Mag. 1859, 3rd ser. vii. 306; Times, 2 Aug. 1859.] A. V.

ELLIOT, Sir HENRY MIERS (1808–1853), Indian civil servant and historian, was the third son, one of the fifteen children, of John Elliot, colonel commandant of the Westminster volunteers, by a daughter of J. C. Lettsom, M.D. Born in 1808 he was educated from the age of ten at Winchester school, and destined for New College, Oxford; but the demand of the East India Company for civilians beyond the numbers regularly trained at Haileybury tempted him to try for an appointment in their service, and he was the first of the 'competition wallahs' to pass an open examination for an immediate post in India. His oriental languages as well as his classics and mathematics proved so good that he was even placed by himself in an honorary class (1826). He was assistant successively to the collector of Bareilli, the political agent at Dehli, and the collector of the southern division of Muradabad; secretary to the Sudder board of revenue for the North-West Provinces; and (1847) secretary to the governor-general in council for the foreign department. In this capacity he accompanied Lord Hardinge to the Panjab and drew up an admirable memoir on its resources. As foreign secretary he also visited the western frontier with Lord Dalhousie, on the occasion of the Sikh war, and negotiated the treaty with the Sikh chiefs relative to the settlement of the Panjab and Gujarat, and received the K.C.B. for his services (1849). Throughout his official career he had devoted his leisure to study. At a very early period he conducted a magazine at Mirat which contained many valuable articles on Indian subjects. With a view to assisting the projected official 'Glossary of Indian Judicial and Revenue Terms,' he published in 1845 at Agra his 'Supplement to the Glossary,' which is rightly described by Professor H. H. Wilson as 'replete with curious and valuable information, especially as regards the tribes and clans of Brahmans and Rajputs.' A second edition appeared in 1860. His chief work, however, was the 'Bibliographical Index to the Historians of Mohammadan India,' in which he proposed to give an analysis of the contents and a criticism of the value of 231 Arabic and Persian historians of India, but of which he only lived to publish the first volume (Calcutta and London, 1849). Failing health compelled him to seek a change of climate, and he died on his way home at Simon's Town, Cape of Good Hope, 20 Dec. 1853, aged 45. He married the daughter of W. Cowell, formerly judge at Bareilli.

Elliot left behind him manuscript collections which were placed in the hands of competent scholars for publication. His historical researches bore fruit in the 'History of India as told by its own Historians,' edited by John Dowson [q.v.], 8 vols. 1866–77, with a 'Sequel,' edited by Sir E. C. Bailey [q. v.], 1886; and it is not too much to say that this magnificent work for the first time establishes the history of India during the Mohammedan period on a sure and trustworthy foundation. Elliot's 'Memoirs of the History, Folklore, and Distribution of the Races of the North-West Provinces' also found an editor in J. Beames, 2 vols. 1869.

[Memoir in vol. i. of the History of India as told by its own Historians, pp. xxviii–ix;

notice by Professor H. H. Wilson in Waller's Imperial Dict. of Univ. Biography; Gent. Mag. new. ser. vol. xli.] S. L.-P.

ELLIOT, HUGH (1752–1830), diplomatist, second son of Sir Gilbert Elliot, third baronet of Stobs, M.P., by Agnes, daughter and heiress of Hugh Dalrymple-Murray-Kynynmound of Melgund, and younger brother of Gilbert, first Earl of Minto, was born on 6 April 1752. He was educated with his elder brother Gilbert, first at home, and then from 1764 to 1766 at the Abbé Choquant's school in Paris, where he struck up a friendship with his fellow-pupil, the great Mirabeau, and accompanied his brother to Christ Church, Oxford, in 1768. After two years at Oxford, he went to the famous military school at Metz, but in 1771 his longing after a military career was checked by the refusal of Lord Barrington, then secretary at war, to confirm the commission which had been granted to him as a child. This was a severe blow to his hopes, and being foiled at home, he went to Vienna in the hope of getting a commission in the Austrian service. In this also he was unsuccessful, but he determined to see war, and served as a volunteer with the Russian army in the campaign of 1772 against the Turks, when, in the words of Romanzow, the Russian general, 'he distinguished himself by a truly British courage.' His father then used his influence to get him a diplomatic appointment, and in 1773, when but one-and-twenty, he was appointed minister plenipotentiary at Munich, and in 1775 representative of the kingdom of Hanover at the diet of Ratisbon as well. He threw up this post in 1776 and returned to England, when his father and brother exerted themselves on his behalf, and in April 1777 he was sent to Berlin as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the court of Prussia. Nothing of great importance happened during his stay at Berlin, but he was recognised as an able diplomatist, and in 1782 he was transferred to Copenhagen. He remained in Denmark for nine years, years of great importance in the history of Denmark, and which finally established Elliot's reputation as a diplomatist. He had every need to exercise his powers, for the King of Denmark, in spite of his relationship to George III, was by no means well disposed towards England, and it was with difficulty that Elliot could carry out Pitt's policy of keeping Denmark in a close political relation with England, in order to counteract the growing power of Russia in the Baltic. In 1791 he was recalled from Copenhagen, and sent on a most secret mission to Paris, of which the details have been hitherto unpublished, but which was almost certainly intended to win over the support of Mirabeau, then the leading statesman of the French assembly, who was an old and intimate friend, and a frequent correspondent of Elliot. After this secret mission he was sent as minister plenipotentiary to Dresden, and remained at the court of Saxony until 1803, when he was transferred to Naples. At his new post he struck up a warm friendship with the queen, the sister of Marie Antoinette, and former friend of Lady Hamilton, and came so far under her influence that he angrily forbade Sir James Henry Craig [q. v.], who was sent to Naples at the head of an English army, to leave Italy, and ordered him to defend the Neapolitan dominions in Italy. Craig wisely refused, and took his army to Sicily, whither the king and queen of Naples speedily fled, and Elliot was recalled from his post. The government decided not to employ him again in diplomacy after this behaviour, but they could not neglect the brother of the powerful and influential Earl of Minto, and in 1809 he was appointed governor of the Leeward Islands. He returned to England in 1813, and in 1814 was sworn of the privy council, and made governor of Madras. Nothing of importance happened during his term of office in India, which lasted until 1820. He afterwards lived in retirement until his death on 10 Dec. 1830. He was buried in Westminster Abbey. His son, Sir Charles, is separately noticed.

[Memoir of the Right Hon. Hugh Elliot, by the Countess of Minto, 1868.] H. M. S.

ELLIOT, JANE or **JEAN** (1727–1805), poet, third daughter of Sir Gilbert Elliot, second baronet of Minto [q. v.], was born in 1727, at Minto House, the family seat in Teviotdale. It is said that she early gave evidence of unusual penetration and sagacity, and that her father, lord justice clerk of Scotland, took a pride in her criticisms on his law papers. Once, when she was about nineteen, she displayed much strength of character and presence of mind, by entertaining with graceful courtesy a party of Jacobites in search of her father as an obnoxious whig. He had had time to escape to the neighbouring crags and conceal himself, and the behaviour of his daughter completely outwitted his pursuers, who withdrew without accomplishing the object of their mission. Sir Gilbert was himself a man of literary tastes. Besides Jane there was another poetical member of the family, her brother Gilbert [q. v.] whose graceful pastoral, 'My sheep I neglected,' is honourably mentioned in the 'Lay of the Last Minstrel.' It was Gilbert who is said

to have suggested to Jane the subject of her exquisite ballad 'The Flowers of the Forest.' The story goes that as they were driving home in the family coach one evening in 1756, they talked of Flodden, and Gilbert wagered 'a pair of gloves or a set of ribbons' against his sister's chances as a writer of a successful ballad on the subject. After this there was silence, and by the time the journey was ended the rough draft of the song was ready. When presently it was published anonymously, and with the most sacred silence on the part of the writer herself and of her friends as to authorship, it won instant success. With the recent example of 'Hardyknute' before them, and in consideration of the quaint pathos and the touching and remote allusions of the ballad, readers were at first inclined to believe that Miss Elliot's 'Flowers of the Forest' was a genuine relic of the past, suddenly and in some miraculous way restored in its perfection. Nor is this to be wondered at, for no ballad in the language is more remarkable for its dramatic propriety and its exhaustive delineation of its theme.

Within a few years after 1756 many changes took place in the family of Minto. Sir Gilbert himself died, and was succeeded by his son Gilbert; other sons were making their way in the world; and Jane Elliot with her mother and sisters left their home and settled in Edinburgh. One glimpse of the ladies in their city home may be taken from Lady Elliot Murray's 'Memoirs.' She visited her relatives in 1772, and found the 'misses,' she says, especially the elder ones, becoming 'perfect beldames in that small society.' Manifestly there was very slight chance of sympathy between the mutually excluding characters suggested by this criticism. According to those who knew her best Jane Elliot was possessed of a certain aristocratic dignity, which would render her, together with her rare intellectual resources, comparatively indifferent to the mere superficial glitter and bustle of social life. After her mother and sisters had died, and she lived alone in the house in Brown Square, Edinburgh, while cautiously coming forward with the fashions, she was slow to break with the past, and was prone to condemn the novelties following in the wake of the French revolution. She is said to have been the last woman in Edinburgh to make regular use of her own sedan-chair. Having lived in the city from 1782 to 1804, Miss Elliot spent her last days amid the scenes of her childhood, and she died either at Minto House or at Mount Teviot, the residence of her younger brother, Admiral John Elliot [q. v.], 29 March 1805.

Jane Elliot is not known to have written any other poem than the 'Flowers of the Forest.' Burns was one of the first to insist that this ballad was a modern composition, and when Sir Walter Scott wrote his 'Border Minstrelsy' he inserted it (in 1803) as 'by a lady of family in Roxburghshire.' Together with Scott, Ramsay of Ochtertyre and Dr. Somerville share the credit of discovering the authorship of the famous ballad.

[Tytler and Watson's Songstresses of Scotland, vol. i.; W. R. Carre's Border Memories; Professor Veitch's History and Poetry of the Scottish Border; Grant Wilson's Poets and Poetry of Scotland, vol. i.; Chambers's Scottish Songs prior to Burns.] T. B.

ELLIOT, JOHN (1725–1782), antiquary, was born in 1725 in the parish of St. John-sub-Castro, Lewes, the son of Obadiah Elliot, proprietor of the brewery still existing in Fisher Street (Lower, *Worthies of Sussex*, p. 329). After learning his rudiments at Lewes grammar school he was articled to an attorney, and eventually secured a good practice, though it would appear that in his earlier years his love for antiquities gave rise to much parental misgiving. When free from parental restraint his business proved equally distracting (Lee [Dunvan], *Hist. of Lewes and Brighthelmstone*, 1795, p. 344), 'and after he had taken unto himself a wife who was a pure regenerated methodist, the good woman's anxiety for his spiritual welfare proved as great a hindrance to the antiquarian investigations as his father's for his temporal prosperity' (*ib.*) Elliot, however, was able to maintain a regular correspondence with several antiquaries of repute, more particularly with Dr. (afterwards Sir William) Burrell [q. v.], and with the Rev. John Watson [q. v.], author of the 'History of the Earls of Warren and Surrey.' To the former he bequeathed his 'manuscript collections of all sorts, bound or unbound, relative to Lewes or Sussex,' which were afterwards incorporated with Burrell's manuscripts, now in the British Museum, while to the latter he furnished much valuable information touching the feudal barony, as may be seen in the 'History' itself (ed. 1782, ii. 245), and in J. G. Nichols's review in Nichols's 'Herald and Genealogist, vii. 201, 204, 205, 207. Elliot, who was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries 7 Dec. 1780 ([Gough,] *List. of Members of Soc. Antiq.* 4to, 1798, p. 33), died suddenly in Southampton Row, Bloomsbury, 28 Feb. 1782, aged 57 (*Gent. Mag.* lii. 150; *Probate Act Book*, P. C. C., 1782), and desired 'to be buried in the vault in St. Michael's churchyard in Lewes with my father and mother.' His will, as 'of the Inner Temple, London, gentleman,'

dated 3 April 1776, with codicil of 31 Oct. 1779, was proved at London on 2 March 1782 (registered in P. C. C., 127, Gostling). By his wife, Margaret Cook of Berwick-upon-Tweed, who survived him, he left no issue. He had brought together a choice antiquarian library at his chambers in the Inner Temple, which he directed to be sold after his death. He never published any of his collections, nor contributed to 'Archæologia.' Those of his manuscripts in the British Museum catalogued separately are 'Notes on Camden's "Britannia,"' Addit. MS. 5703; 'Notes to a Register of Lewes,' Addit. MS. 6351, f. 70; 'Letters to Rev. Robert Austen [a Lewes antiquary], 1774, 1775,' Addit. MS. 6351, ff. 43, 50, 53.

[Authorities cited in the text.] G. G.

ELLIOT, JOHN (*d.* 1808), admiral, third son of Sir Gilbert Elliot (*d.* 1766) [q. v.], brother of Sir Gilbert Elliot (1722–1777) [q. v.], and uncle of Gilbert Elliot, first earl of Minto [q. v.], was promoted to the rank of lieutenant on 30 April 1756, and the following year, 5 April 1757, was posted to the Royal William. The appointment was merely nominal, but he was immediately transferred to the Hussar of 28 guns, which, during the latter part of 1757 and the summer of 1758, was attached to the grand fleet under Hawke and Anson. Towards the end of 1758 he commissioned the Æolus, a 32-gun frigate then newly launched, and on 19 March 1759, while cruising on the south coast of Bretagne in company with the Isis of 50 guns, fell in with a squadron of four French frigates in charge of convoy. The convoy and two of the frigates got clear away, chased by the Isis; the two others, Blonde and Mignonne, interposed to prevent the Æolus following. After a sharp action the Mignonne was captured, but the Blonde made good her escape (Beatson, ii. 347). During the year the Æolus continued on the coast of France, under the orders of Sir Edward Hawke, and on 27 Dec. sailed from Quiberon Bay on a cruise, in company with the Intrepid of 64 guns. Bad weather came on; the two ships separated; the Æolus, blown off shore, was unable to work up to the Isle Groix, the appointed rendezvous; and, her provisions running short, she put into Kinsale on 21 Jan. 1760 in order to get a supply. 'I purpose,' Elliot wrote to the admiralty, 'returning off Isle Groix as soon as they can be completed, in further execution of my orders.' Continued bad weather and southerly gales, however, delayed the provisioning and prevented his sailing, so that he was still at Kinsale on 24 Feb., when he received a letter from the lord-lieutenant addressed to 'The Captain or Commanding Officer of His Majesty's ships of war at Kinsale,' informing him of the presence of M. Thurot's squadron of three ships in Belfast Lough, and of their having landed a strong body of troops at Carrickfergus. It was a circular letter, a copy of which was sent express to all the ports on the chance of finding ships of war at some of them. None were stationed on the coast; the Æolus was at Kinsale solely by the accident of the weather; so also were two other 32-gun frigates, the Pallas and Brilliant, which had sought shelter there a few days before. Taking these two ships under his orders, Elliot immediately put to sea, and 'on the evening of the 26th made the entrance of Carrickfergus, but could not get in, the wind being contrary and very bad weather.' Thurot, on his side, having failed in his contemplated dash at Belfast, had re-embarked his men on the 25th, but was detained by the same bad weather, and did not weigh till midnight of the 27th. According to Elliot's official letter, dated in Ramsay Bay on 29 Feb. 1760: 'On the 28th at four in the morning we got sight of them and gave chase. At nine I got up alongside their commodore off the Isle of Mann; and in a few minutes after, the action became general and lasted about an hour and a half, when they all three struck their colours.' Thurot's presence on the coast had caused so much alarm that the news of his capture and death gave rise to excessive and undignified rejoicing. The action, creditable enough in itself, was almost absurdly magnified by popular report, to such an extent, indeed, that even forty-four years after, Nelson, writing to Lord Minto and speaking of Elliot, said: 'His action with Thurot will stand the test with any of our modern victories' (Nicolas, *Nelson Despatches*, v. 366). In point of fact, the French force, though nominally superior, was disintegrated by disaffection, mutiny, and sickness. The ships, too, had been severely strained by the long persistent bad weather to which they had been exposed, and many of their guns had been struck below.

On 7 March the ships and their prizes, having to some extent refitted in Ramsay Bay, sailed for Plymouth, but, meeting with a southerly gale, again put into Kinsale, and finally arrived at Spithead on the 25th. After a short cruise on the coast of France, and the capture of a brig laden with naval stores, which was cut out from under the guns of a battery on Belle Isle, the Æolus returned to Spithead. She was then ordered to be docked, and Elliot was meanwhile appointed to the Gosport of 40 guns, in which he convoyed

the Baltic trade as far as the Sound. On his return he rejoined the Æolus, and was sent to his old cruising ground in the Bay of Biscay. In the spring of 1761 he again came to Spithead, bringing with him a small privateer which he had captured off Cape Finisterre. He was then appointed to the Chichester of 70 guns, and sent out to the Mediterranean, where he remained till the peace. From 1764 to 1771 he successively commanded the Bellona, the Firme, and the Portland as guardships at Plymouth, and in April 1777 he commissioned the Trident of 64 guns. On 22 April he was ordered to wear a broad pennant and to carry over to North America the commissioners appointed to negotiate with the revolted colonies. He arrived at Sandy Hook early in June, and for two months acted as second in command of the station, under Lord Howe. He then quitted the Trident and returned to England. Towards the end of 1779 he commissioned the Edgar of 74 guns, one of the fleet which sailed on 29 Dec., under Sir George Rodney, for the relief of Gibraltar. In the action off Cape St. Vincent on 16 Jan. 1780 the Edgar had a distinguished share; and after the relief of the Rock, and on the departure of the fleet, Elliot remained behind as senior naval officer, but returned to England a few months later, a ship of the Edgar's size being found useless under the existing circumstances. For the next two years she formed part of the Channel fleet under Geary, Darby, or Howe, and on 12 Dec. 1781 was one of the small squadron with which Kempenfelt effected his brilliant capture of French convoy, and, being the leading ship of the line as it passed the French rear, was for a time sharply engaged with the Triomphant [see Kempenfelt, Richard]. In June 1782 Elliot was removed into the Romney, and was under orders to go out to the West Indies, with a broad pennant, when peace was concluded. From 1786 to 1789 he was governor and commander-in-chief at Newfoundland, and during this time, on 24 Sept. 1787, was advanced to flag rank. On 21 Feb. 1790 he became a vice-admiral, and during the Spanish armament hoisted his flag in the Barfleur. On 16 April 1795 he attained the rank of admiral, but had no further service. His health was much broken, and during his latter years he led a quiet country life at his seat in Roxburghshire, Mount Teviot, where he died on 20 Sept. 1808.

[Charnock's Biog. Nav. vii. 224; Naval Chronicle, ix. 425; Beatson's Nav. and Mil. Memoirs; Laughton's Studies in Naval History, pp. 342–359; Official Letters in the Public Record Office.] J. K. L.

ELLIOT or Sheldon, NATHANIEL (1705–1780), jesuit, born 1 May 1705, entered the Society of Jesus in 1723 and was admitted to the profession of the four vows in 1741. He adopted the *alias* of Sheldon, his aunt Mary Anne, daughter of John Elliot, esq., of Gatacre Park, Shropshire, being the wife of Ralph Sheldon, esq., of Beoley, Worcestershire. In October 1748 he was appointed rector of the college at St. Omer, having been previously socius to the provincial, Henry Sheldon, his cousin; and from 1756 to 1762 he was rector of the English College at Rome. In 1766 he became rector of the Greater College, Bruges, and later in the same year he was nominated provincial of his order in England. While holding this office he resided in the family of Mr. Nevill at Holt, Leicestershire, where he died on 10 Oct. 1780.

The 'Occasional Letters on the Affairs of the Jesuits in France' was collected and published under his direction, together with 'The Judgment of the Bishops of France concerning the Doctrine, Government, Conduct, and Usefulness of the French Jesuits,' London, 1763, 8vo. He was also the translator of Pinamonti's treatise on 'The Cross in its True Light; or, the Weight of Tribulation lessened,' London, 1775, 12mo.

[Foley's Records, vii. 223; Oliver's Collectanea S. J., p. 85; Gillow's Bibl. Dict.; De Backer's Bibl. des Écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus (1869), p. 1719.] T. C.

ELLIOT, ROBERT (*fl.* 1822–1833), captain in the royal navy and topographical draughtsman from 1822 to 1824, made a series of sketches, taken on the spot, of views in India, Canton, and the Red Sea. These were worked up by Samuel Prout, Clarkson Stanfield, and others into finished drawings, and were published in parts by Fisher & Co., appearing 1830–3, under the title, 'Views in the East, comprising India, Canton, and the Red Sea, with Historical and Descriptive Letterpress by Emma Roberts.'

[Arnold's Library of the Fine Arts, i. 152; Nagler's Künstler-Lexikon; Universal Catalogue of Books on Art.] L. C.

ELLIOT, Sir WALTER (1803–1887), Indian civil servant and archæologist, born on 16 Jan. 1803, was a son of James Elliot of Wolfelee, Roxburghshire, a member of a junior branch of the old border family of Elliot of Lariston. His early education was conducted partly at private schools and partly at home under a private tutor. In 1818 he was sent to Haileybury College, having obtained a writership in the service of the East India Company at Madras. Reaching India in 1821, he was

appointed to the public service in 1823, first as assistant to the collector and magistrate of Salem, from which office he was shortly afterwards transferred to the Southern Mahratta country, then administered by the government of Madras. In the first year of his service in that part of India he was present at the insurrection at Kittúr, when the political agent, Mr. Thackeray, and three officers of a troop of horse artillery sent thither to maintain order, and a large number of men, were killed; Elliot and Stevenson, a brother assistant, being made prisoners, and detained for several weeks in the hands of the insurgents at great peril of their lives. In the latter part of Elliot's service in the Southern Mahratta country that territory was annexed to the Bombay presidency, and Elliot, in the ordinary course, would have been retransferred to a Madras district, but at the special request of Sir John Malcolm, then governor of Bombay, he was allowed to remain until he left India on furlough in 1833. Leaving Bombay on 11 Dec. in that year in company with Mr. Robert Pringle of the Bombay civil service, Elliot returned to Europe by way of the Red Sea, landing at Kosseir, and riding across the Egyptian desert to Thebes, whence, taking the Nile route as far as Cairo, he crossed into Palestine, and was present, in company with the Hon. Robert Curzon, the author of 'The Monasteries of the Levant,' at the exhibition of the holy fire in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, when so many people were killed (Curzon, *Monasteries of the Levant*, ch. xvi.) After visiting Constantinople, Athens, Corfu, and Rome, he reached England on 5 May 1835. In the autumn of the following year he again embarked for India as private secretary to his relative, Lord Elphinstone, who had been appointed governor of Madras, and the remainder of his Indian service was spent in the Madras presidency.

During the years immediately succeeding Lord Elphinstone's retirement from the government, which took place in 1842, Elliot was employed upon the ordinary duties of a member of the board of revenue; but in 1845 he was deputed to investigate the condition of Guntúr, one of the districts commonly known as the Northern Sirkárs, where there had been a serious falling off in the revenue and a general impoverishment of the people, caused, as Elliot's inquiries proved, by the wasteful extravagance and extortion of the zemindárs, and by the malversation of the native revenue officials. Elliot's recommendations, involving, among other matters, a complete survey and reassessment of the district and the permanent resumption of the defaulting zemindáries, which had been already sold for arrears of revenue and bought in by the government, were sanctioned, although upon terms less liberal to the zemindárs than Elliot had proposed; and at the instance of the court of directors, who pronounced a high encomium upon his work at Guntúr, he was appointed commissioner, with the powers of the board of revenue in all revenue matters, for the administration of the whole of the northern sirkárs. In this responsible charge he remained until 1854, when he was appointed a member of the council of the governor of Madras. He finally retired from the civil service, and left India early in 1860.

As a member of council Elliot's duties, though not more arduous, were of a more varied character than those which had devolved upon him as a revenue officer. Besides the various revenue questions which came before the government there were many subjects of great public interest with which he was eminently qualified to deal. Among these were the question of native education, and such matters as the relations of the British government in India with christian missions on the one hand and with the religious endowments of the Hindus and Muhammadans on the other hand. With the natives he had throughout his service maintained a free and friendly intercourse. Native education was a subject to which he had long paid considerable attention. He had also been throughout his Indian life a cordial friend, and, in his private capacity, a generous supporter of christian missions. In connection with education he was a staunch advocate of the grant-in-aid system. While senior member of council it devolved upon him, owing to the illness of the governor, Lord Harris, to preside on the occasion of the public reading at Madras of the queen's proclamation issued on her majesty's assumption of the direct government of India.

In addition to his labours as a public servant Elliot devoted much time to investigations into the archæology and the natural history of India. At a very early period of his residence in the Southern Mahratta country Elliot commenced his archæological inquiries. Working in concert with a young Brahman who was attached to his office, he mastered the archaic characters in which the old inscriptions were written, and during the remainder of his life in India employed much of his leisure in deciphering and translating the inscriptions found by him in various parts of the country. In zoology, ornithology, and botany he took the keenest interest. In 1837 he published in the 'Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society' a paper on 'Hindu Inscrip-

tions;' and from that time to the end of his life he was a frequent contributor to one or other of the journals which deal with the objects of his favourite researches. The journals named at the foot of this article all contain contributions, some of them numerous contributions, from his pen, the results of accurate and intelligent observation, recorded in a clear and popular style. His most important work is his treatise on the coins of Southern India, published in 1885, when the author was in his eighty-third year, which forms part ii. of the third volume of the 'International Numismata Orientalia,' and contains an interesting account of the ancient races and dynasties of Southern India, derived from the inscriptions and coins which have been discovered. A remarkable fact connected with this treatise, and with all Elliot's later compositions, is that when they were written the author, who had been extremely near-sighted all his life, was all but blind, latterly quite blind, and had to depend upon the pen of an amanuensis to commit them to paper, and upon the eyes of relatives and friends to correct the proofs. His collection of South Indian coins, about four hundred in number, and a collection of carved marbles belonging to a Buddhist tope at Amrávati, which he made when residing in the Guntúr district in 1845, are now deposited in the British Museum, where the marbles are placed on the walls facing, and on each side of, the grand staircase.

During the last twenty-four years of his life Elliot resided principally at his house at Wolfelee, taking an active part in parochial and county business. At his house, which was quite a museum, he was always glad to receive and instruct persons who were engaged in his favourite studies. He possessed a singularly calm and equable temper, and bore with unfailing patience and resignation a deprivation which to most men with his tastes and with his active mind would have been extremely trying. His intellectual vigour remained undiminished literally to the last hour of his life. On the morning of the day of his death, 1 March 1887, he dictated and signed with his own hand a note to Dr. Pope, the eminent Tamil scholar, stating that on the previous day he had read (i.e. heard read) with much appreciation a notice of Dr. Pope's forthcoming edition of the 'Kurral,' and that, notwithstanding loss of sight and advancing years, his 'interest in oriental literature continues unabated,' and inquiring whether his correspondent could suggest any method of utilising certain 'disjecta fragmenta' connected with Francis White Ellis [q. v.], which he had collected many years before. In the evening he died with little or no suffering.

In recognition of his services in India Elliot was created in 1866 a K.C.S.I. In 1877 he was appointed a fellow of the Royal Society, and in 1878 he received from the university of Edinburgh the degree of LL.D. He was a deputy-lieutenant and magistrate for Roxburghshire. In 1839 he was married at Malta to Maria Dorothea, daughter of Sir David Blair, bart., of Blairquhan, Ayrshire, who survives him (1888), and by whom he left three sons and two daughters.

Elliot's principal writings are contained in the following publications: 'Indian Antiquary,' vols. v. vi. vii. xii. xiv. xv. xvi.; 'Madras Journal of Literature and Science,' vols. vii. x. xi. xiii. xv. xix. xx. xxi.; 'Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,' 1837; 'Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,' 1851; 'Flora Andhrica,' 1859; 'Transactions of the Botanical Society,' 1862, 1871; 'Berwickshire National Club Journal,' 1867, 1872, 1873, 1874, 1878, 1881, 1887; 'Transactions of the International Congress of Prehistoric Archæology at Norwich,' 1868; 'Journal of the Ethnological Society,' 1869, vol. i.; 'Report of the British Association,' 1872; 'Proceedings of the Antiquarian Society of Scotland,' 1874, 1885; 'Athenæum,' 10 April 1875; 'Proceedings of the Zoological Society,' 1880; 'International Numismata Orientalia,' vol. iii. pt. ii.

[Obituary notice by the present writer in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for July 1887, based partly upon information contained in the Records of the Madras Government, and partly upon personal knowledge.] A. J. A.

ELLIOTSON, JOHN (1791–1868), physician, son of a chemist and druggist, was born in 1791 in London. He received his preliminary education as a private pupil of the rector of St. Saviour's, Southwark. He then proceeded to Edinburgh, and subsequently entered Jesus College, Cambridge. He attended the medical and surgical classes of St. Thomas's and Guy's Hospital for three years, after which he was elected one of the assistants at Guy's, which appointment he held for five years. In 1821 he graduated as M.D. At this time he exhibited considerable fondness for the study of the action of medicines. This no doubt led to his therapeutical experiments at a later period, when he frequently alarmed his colleagues at University College Hospital by administering to his patients extravagantly large doses of drugs usually considered as poisonous. His desire to be original led Elliotson into many eccentricities. In 1826 he discarded knee-

breeches and silk stockings, which were then the orthodox dress of physicians, and he was one of the first to wear a beard in this country. In 1831 he was appointed professor of the practice of medicine in the university of London; in this position he distinguished himself by his lectures, which became at once exceedingly popular. To his energy and perseverance the establishment of the University College Hospital was due, and he delivered in 1834 some lectures there which firmly established his reputation as a teacher. In 1829, at the request of the president of the Royal College of Physicians, he delivered before that body the 'Lumley Lectures on the recent Improvements in the Art of distinguishing the various Diseases of the Heart.' These lectures were divided into three parts: first, embracing diseases of the external membrane of the heart; secondly, those of the internal membrane; thirdly, those of the substance of the heart and the aorta. They were published in 1830, and about the same time Elliotson issued several expositions on interesting pathological facts. He also translated Blumenbach's 'Physiology,' to which he added very copious and comprehensive notes. Elliotson was the founder of the Phrenological Society, of which he was the first president. He was also elected president of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society of London. At this time, 1837, Elliotson had established his position as one of the ablest thinkers among the physicians of the metropolis. His ever active mind was continually exercised on the new and often strange phenomena of the nervous system. Phrenology claimed much of his time and attention, and he professed to have established some facts in connection with its obscure phenomena. This led him to examine the empirical conditions in connection with disease of the pseudo-science of Mesmer. He became an ardent student of mesmerism, and professed to have convinced himself of the substantial truth of the occult agency and of the abnormal phenomena produced by the manipulations, which excited considerable very unhealthy interest in the minds of a large number of the public. The *séances* at his house were largely attended by the fashionable classes, and results obtained by practising on epileptic patients and designing girls were received by them as miraculous. These exhibitions and the earnest expression of his belief in the reality of mesmerism led to differences between Elliotson, the medical council of University College, and his colleagues in general, which compelled him to resign his professorship in December 1838.

During his connection with hospital practice Elliotson gave the first impulse to the advantages of clinical teaching, and he was the earliest to adopt the practice of auscultation, which he did with singular skill. In 1829 he became Lumleian lecturer, and two years later he became professor of clinical medicine in the then new university of London. He was also the first to use the stethoscope. He had now reached the zenith of his fame. He was without doubt the foremost among the eminent physicians of the day, and his lectures were regularly reported in the 'Lancet,' which added much to their popularity and considerably increased his practice as a consulting physician.

In 1830 Elliotson published his 'Lumleian Lectures,' and his 'Principles and Practice of Medicine' in 1839. Numerous papers were contributed by him to the 'Medical Times' and other professional journals. After the resignation of his appointment in 1838 he only once appeared in his official capacity as a medical teacher, being nominated the Harveian orator in 1846.

Although Elliotson continued to practise mesmerism upon his patients, he refrained from introducing the subject to any of those by whom he was largely consulted. His diagnosis of the nature of disease was as searching and as skilful as it had ever been, and he prescribed with the greatest care and judgment the remedies best suited as curative agents. But if the patient showed an interest in mesmerism, Elliotson at once gave full directions for producing the mesmeric coma, and was ready to recommend it as the only method by which relief was to be obtained.

For several years Elliotson continued the practice of mesmerism, and received at his house crowds, before whom the extravagant phenomena connecting mesmerism with phrenology were exhibited. He established in 1849 a mesmeric hospital, at which numerous cures were said to have been effected. Notwithstanding the severity of the censures passed upon him for his advocacy of mesmerism, the breath of slander never ventured to attack his private character. Thackeray dedicated 'Pendennis' to him (1850) in gratitude for his services, and he received a similar tribute from Dickens (Forster, *Dickens*, ii. 86). Among other things he started a magazine, devoted to records of the effects produced by the practice of mesmerism, called the 'Zoist.' He continued it until the completion of the thirteenth volume.

His health failing him Elliotson was under the necessity of seeking some repose. He found this as a member of the family of Dr. E. S. Symes, who was one of his pupils, and

ever his most devoted friend. There, passing through the stages of decline, he died on 29 July 1868, in Davies Street, Berkeley Square, and was buried in Kensal Green cemetery.

[Cates's Dict. of General Biog. 1881; Walford's Men of the Time; Lancet, 1868; Medical Times; Zoist; personal knowledge.] R. H–T.

ELLIOTT. [See also Eliot, Elliott, and Elliot.]

ELLIOTT, CHARLOTTE (1789–1871), hymn-writer, daughter of Charles Elliott, by Eling, daughter of Henry Venn, sister of Henry Venn Elliott [q.v.] and Edward Bishop Elliott [q. v.], was born 17 March 1789. She showed literary talent, and in her youth wrote humorous verses. After a severe illness in 1821 she became a permanent invalid, and the influence of Cæsar Malan of Geneva, whose acquaintance she made in 1822, induced her to give up all secular pursuits. She wrote many religious poems, which appeared as 'Hymns for a Week,' of which forty thousand copies were sold; 'Hours of Sorrow' (1840 and many later editions), and the 'Invalid's Hymn Book.' The last, privately printed in 1834, included 'Just as I am,' a hymn which has had extraordinary popularity, and been translated 'into almost every living language.' She edited the 'Christian Remembrancer Pocket-book' from 1834 to 1859, contributing many of her own hymns. She lived with her father at Clapham, and then at Brighton. In 1845 she moved to Torquay, but in 1857 returned to Brighton, where she remained till her death, 22 Sept. 1871.

The Religious Tract Society has published 'Selections' from her poems with a memoir by her sister, Mrs. Babington, and 'Leaves from unpublished Journals, Correspondence, and Note-books.'

[Information from the family; Memoir as above; Memoir by 'H. L. L.' prefixed to an illustrated edition of 'Just as I am' (1885).]

ELLIOTT, EBENEZER (1781–1849), the corn-law rhymer, was born at the New Foundry, Masborough, parish of Rotherham, Yorkshire, 17 March 1781. His father's ancestors were border raiders, 'thieves, neither Scotch nor English, who lived on the cattle they stole from both.' His father, known as 'Devil Elliott,' was engaged in the iron trade, was in politics an extreme radical, and in religion an ultra-Calvinist. His mother came from near Huddersfield, where from time immemorial her ancestors had lived on their lot of freehold ground. Her health was bad, and made her life 'one long sigh.' Elliott was one of a family of eleven, of whom eight reached mature life. Elliott was baptised by Tommy Wright, a tinker, of the same religious persuasion as the father. He was first educated at a dame's school, then under Joseph Ramsbotham at Hollis school, where he was 'taught to write and little more.' Various changes of school followed. In his sixth year he had the small-pox, which left him 'fearfully disfigured and six weeks blind.' This increased a natural timidity of disposition and fondness for solitude. About fourteen he began to read extensively on his own account. He kept this up, though early engaged in business, and from sixteen to twenty-three working for his father without any other pecuniary reward than a little pocket-money. In his leisure hours he studied botany, collected plants and flowers, and was delighted at the appearance of 'a beautiful green snake about a yard long, which on the fine Sabbath mornings about ten o'clock seemed to expect me at the top of Primrose Lane.' His love of nature, he says, caused him 'to desert both alehouse and chapel.' When seventeen he wrote his first poem, the 'Vernal Walk,' dedicated to Miss Austen. Other early pieces were 'Second Nuptials' and 'Night, or the Legend of Wharncliffe,' which last was described with some justice by the 'Monthly Review' as the '*Ne plus ultra* of German horror and bombast.' His 'Tales of the Night,' including 'The Exile' and 'Bothwell,' were of more merit, and brought him high commendation from Southey. Then followed at various intervals 'Love,' 'The Letter,' 'They met again,' 'Withered Wild Flowers,' 'Spirits and Men.' This last was an 'epic poem' of the world before the flood, dedicated, 'as evidence of my presumption and my despair,' to James Montgomery the poet. There are occasional passages of genuine inspiration in all these ambitious poems, but the turgid and pseudo-romantic also largely figure there. Imperfections of education and a want of humour fully account for the defects.

More practical and interesting, if more commonplace subjects, soon engaged Elliott's undivided attention. He had married at Rotherham. His wife brought him a small fortune. He invested it in the business, 'already bankrupt beyond redemption,' in which his father had a share (Searle, p. 93). The father had been already unfortunate in trading. His difficulties hastened his wife's death, and he himself died soon after her. Elliott's efforts were unable to retrieve the fortunes of the firm. After some years of strenuous effort he lost every penny he had in the world, and was obliged to live for some time dependent on his wife's sisters. His own misfortunes, as well as

those of his parents, he attributed to the operation of the corn laws. In 1821 his wife's relatives raised a little money, and with this as capital he started in business in the iron trade in Sheffield. On the whole he was very prosperous for a number of years. Some days he made as much as 20*l.* without leaving his counting-house, or even seeing the goods from which he made the profits. His prosperity attained its highest point in 1837, when he ought, he says, to have retired. He lost heavily after that for some time, but was able notwithstanding to settle up his business and leave Sheffield in 1842 with about 6,000*l.* His losses here were again, he thought, due to the manner in which the corn laws impeded his efforts.

At Sheffield Elliott was most active in literature and politics, as well as in commerce. The bust of Shakespeare in his counting-house, the casts of Achilles, Ajax, and Napoleon in his workshop typified the fact that he had other interests besides money-making. He engaged in the reform agitation, but was disappointed at what he thought the small results of the measure. He then engaged actively in the chartist movement, and was present as delegate from Sheffield in the great public meeting held in Palace Yard, Westminster, in 1838. When O'Connor induced the chartists to repudiate the corn law repeal agitation, he withdrew from the chartist movement, for his hatred of the 'bread tax' was all through the deepest principle in his life. He believed it had caused his father's ruin, his own losses and disappointments, both as workman and capitalist; it was ruining the country, and would cause a terrible revolution. Thus all his efforts came to be directed to the repeal agitation. 'Our labour, our skill, our profits, our hopes, our lives, our children's souls are bread taxed,' he exclaims. He scarcely spoke or wrote of anything besides the corn laws. My heart, he writes,

> . . . once soft as woman's tears, is gnarled
> In the gloating on the ills I cannot cure.

It was this state of mind that produced the 'Corn-law Rhymes' (1831), 'Indignatio facit versus.' They are couched in vigorous and direct language, and are full of graphic phrases. The bread tax has 'its maw like the grave;' the poacher 'feeds on partridge because bread is dear;' bad government is

> The deadly *will* that takes
> What labour ought to keep;
> It is the deadly *power* that makes
> Bread dear and labour cheap.

They are free from the straining after effect, and from the rhapsodies, commonplaces, and absurdities which disfigure much of Elliott's other poetry. Representing the feelings of the opposers of the corn laws, the rhymes give us a truer idea of the fierce passion of the time than even the speeches of Cobden and Bright. Animated by somewhat of the same feelings as the 'Corn-law Rhymes' are 'The Ranter,' 'The Village Patriarch' (1829), and 'The Splendid Village,' all vividly describing life among the poor in England. Elliott also wrote 'Keronah, a drama;' a brief and somewhat curious piece on Napoleon Bonaparte, entitled 'Great Folks at Home,' and a large number of miscellaneous poems, including 'Rhymed Rambles.' After his retirement from business in 1841 Elliott lived at Great Houghton, near Barnsley, where he was chiefly occupied in literary pursuits. He died there, having lived to see the hated 'bread tax' abolished, on 1 Dec. 1849, and was buried at Darfield Church. Very shortly before his death his daughter was married to John Watkins, his biographer. Elliott had a family of thirteen children, most of whom, together with his wife, survived him. Elliott was a small, meek-looking man. Though engaged in many almost revolutionary movements, and though once in danger of prosecution, he was really conservative by nature, and brought up two of his sons as clergymen of the established church. It was only under a burning sense of injustice that he acted as he did. 'My feelings,' he says, 'have been hammered until they have become *cold*-short, and are apt to snap and fly off in sarcasms.' But except when roused he was good-natured and pleasant; too much given, his friends thought, to say kind things to the many scribblers who in later days sent their verses to him. 'I do not like to give pain,' he remarked; 'writing will do these poor devils no harm, but good, and save them from worse things.' As a speaker, Elliott was practical and vigorous, though at times given to extravagant statements. A bronze statue, by Burnard of London, subscribed for by the working men of Sheffield, was erected at a cost of 600*l.* in the market-place of that town, in 1854, to the memory of Elliott. Landor wrote a fine ode on the occasion. The statue was afterwards removed to Weston Park.

[Watkins's Life, Poetry, and Letters of Ebenezer Elliott (1850); Searle's Memoir of Ebenezer Elliott (1850); Early Autobiography in Athenæum, 12 Jan. 1850; R. E. Leader's Reminiscences of Old Sheffield (1876). A new and revised edition of Elliott's works, edited by his son, Edwin Elliott, was published in 1876. Portraits are prefixed to Tait's edition (Edinburgh, 1840), and an edition of the Splendid Village, &c., published in 1833. An interesting critique by Carlyle on the Corn-law Rhymes is included in his

Essays, and Professor Dowden has written a few lines about him in T. H. Ward's English Poets, iv. 495–6; see also Notes and Queries, 5th ser. iii. 146, 6th ser. iii. 488, 495; Sheffield Post Office Directory.] F. W–T.

ELLIOTT, EDWARD BISHOP (1793–1875), divine, second son of Charles Elliott by his second wife, Eling, daughter of Henry Venn, and younger brother of Henry Venn Elliott [q. v.], and of Charlotte Elliott [q.v.], was born 24 July 1793. He went to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated as third 'senior optime' in January 1816, and was elected to a fellowship in 1817. In the end of that year he joined his brother Henry at Rome, made a tour to Italy and Greece, and returned to England in the spring of 1819. He wrote the Seatonian prize poems in 1821 and 1822. In 1824 he accepted the vicarage of Tuxford, Nottinghamshire, in the gift of the college. In 1853 he received the prebend of Heytesbury, Wiltshire, and became incumbent of St. Mark's Church, Brighton, opened in 1849 by the exertions of his brother Henry. He died 30 July 1875. He was twice married: (1) on 26 April 1826 to Mary, daughter of J. King of Torwood, Sussex, by whom he had four children: Edward King Elliott, rector of Worthing, Sussex; Henry Venn (died young); Eugenia, married to Rev. A. Synge; and Mary, married to Rev. Clement Cobb. (2) 1 Oct. 1835 to Harriette, daughter of Sir Richard Steele, bart., by whom he had three children: Emily Steele, Anna Maria, married to Rev. R. D. Monro, and Albert Augustus (*d.* 1883). Elliott was a member of the evangelical school, and was active in the discharge of his duties as a parish clergyman and as an advocate of missionary enterprise. He was specially interested in the study of prophecy. His chief work, the result of many years' labour, appeared in 1844 under the title, 'Horæ Apocalypticæ, or a Commentary on the Apocalypse Critical and Historical . . .,' 3 vols. Sir James Stephen, referring to this work in his essay on the 'Clapham Sect,' calls it a 'book of profound learning, singular ingenuity, and almost bewitching interest.' It went through five editions, and has been more than once abridged. Elliott's interpretation agrees generally with that of the protestant commentators who identify the papal power with Antichrist, and expect the millennium to begin before the end of the nineteenth century. It led to several controversies with Dr. Candlish, Dr. Keith, and others. His other works, most of them bearing upon the interpretation of prophecy, are: 1. 'Sermons,' 1836. 2. 'The Question, "What is the Beast?" answered,' 1838. 3. 'Vindiciæ Horariæ' (letters to Dr. Keith), 1848. 4. 'The Downfall of Despotism,' &c., 1853. 5. 'The Delusion of the Tractarian Clergy' (upon the validity of orders), 1856. 6. 'The Warburtonian Lectures from 1849 to 1853,' 1856. 7. 'Apocalypsis Alfordiana' (upon Dean Alford's views of the Apocalypse). 8. 'Confirmation Lectures,' 1865. 9. 'Memoir of the fifth Earl of Aberdeen,' 1867.

[Information from the family; Christian Observer for October, 1875.]

ELLIOTT, GRACE DALRYMPLE (1758?–1823), was the youngest daughter of Hew Dalrymple, an Edinburgh advocate concerned in the great Douglas case, who was an LL.D. in 1771, and died in 1774. Her mother, on being left by her husband, had rejoined her parents, in whose house Grace was born. She was educated in a French convent, was introduced by her father on her return into Edinburgh society, and her beauty made such an impression on Dr. (afterwards Sir) John Elliott [q. v.], an opulent physician, that he made her an offer of marriage, 1771. Though much her senior he was accepted. Elliott mixed in fashionable circles, and his young wife was not proof against their seductions. After repeated intrigues she eloped in 1774 with Lord Valentia, upon which Elliott obtained a divorce with 12,000*l.* damages. Grace was then taken by her brother to a French convent, but seems to have been brought back almost immediately by Lord Cholmondeley, whose visit to Paris in November 1774 may have been made for that purpose. She became known as 'Dolly the tall,' and gave birth, probably about 1782, to a daughter, who was named Georgiana Augusta Frederica Seymour. The Prince of Wales claimed the paternity, albeit Charles Windham and George Selwyn were thought to have pretensions, not to speak of Cholmondeley himself, who appears to have represented to Horace Walpole that the child was his. The prince showed great interest in the girl, but according to Raikes prohibited her on her marriage from quartering the royal arms with the sign of bastardy. The prince probably introduced Mrs. Elliott to the Duke of Orleans (Egalité), who was in England for the third time in 1784, and about 1786 she settled at Paris. The death of Sir John Elliott (1786) may have given her greater freedom of action, and she received, or continued to receive, 200*l.* from his estate, besides having a handsome allowance from the Prince of Wales. Her daughter, brought up in the Cholmondeley family, and married from their house in 1808 to Lord Charles Bentinck at Chester, is said to have paid her several visits in Paris and to have been

noticed by Marie Antoinette. An anonymous tourist of 1788 speaks of Mrs. Elliott as 'an occasional solace' of Orleans. She remained in France all through the revolution, and in 1859 her granddaughter, Georgiana Augusta Frederica Bentinck (1811–1883), only child of Lady Charles, who had died in 1813, offered, against the wish of her family, first to the British Museum and then to the late Mr. Richard Bentley, a manuscript entitled 'Journal of my Life during the French Revolution.' It was stated to have been written about 1801, on Mrs. Elliott's return to England, for the perusal of George III, to whom Sir David Dundas had spoken of her experiences, and Miss Bentinck produced as confirmation of its authenticity her grandmother's miniature by Cosway, as also Orleans's miniature on a snuff-box presented by him to Mrs. Elliott. The manuscript was published by Mr. Bentley without alteration, except division into chapters and paragraphs, and the insertion of a short summary of Mrs. Elliott's life before and after the revolution, apparently based on Miss Bentinck's recollections of her grandmother's conversation or on hearsay. The lapse of time may have impaired these recollections, but when we find equal inaccuracies in the journal itself it is difficult to acquit Mrs. Elliott of habitually embellishing her stories. Her very title is a misnomer, for the work is confessedly a narrative written seven or eight years after the experiences it relates. She is not indeed directly responsible for the statement that she was born about 1765, which would make her nine years of age when divorced, nor for the suggestion that Bonaparte offered her marriage. She professes, however, to have been in four Paris prisons, whereas her name is not on the register of any of them. She describes as the most heartrending scene she ever witnessed the parting at the Carmelites of Custine and his wife, whereas Custine was never at the Carmelites, and his wife was not arrested till two months after his execution. This and other inaccurate stories were perhaps borrowed from a Mrs. Meyler or Miglia, the English widow of an Italian, who was really in captivity with Beauharnais, Josephine, and Santerre. Possibly this Mrs. Miglia was herself as imaginative as her friend. But Mrs. Elliott can be confronted not only by facts and dates but by her own testimony. She gives a highly piquant account of her imprisonment in the same room at Versailles with the octogenarian Dr. Gem, Huskisson's great-uncle, whom she represents as extremely self-possessed, going to bed (for want of candles) at seven, getting up at four to read Locke or Helvetius (in the dark?), and waking her at seven to try and argue her into scepticism. Now in 1796 she told Lord Malmesbury that Gem cried the whole time and was terrified to death, while Gem in his turn spoke to Malmesbury and Swinburne of his fellow-prisoner and her dogs, of which the lady says nothing. Nevertheless the book is very entertaining, and undoubtedly contains much that is true. She may be assumed to be correct when she alleges that she went to Brussels in 1790 to promote Orleans's pretensions to the dukedom of Brabant, and again later on with a message from Marie Antoinette to Monsieur (Louis XVIII). The addendum states that on her return to England the Prince of Wales was again enamoured of her, that she went back to France in 1814, and that in order to remain there she had to adopt a native, whereupon she selected the daughter of Orleans's English groom, born on French soil. This adoption, with its flimsy legal pretext, bears a suspicious resemblance to Madame de Genlis's adoption of Hermione, and we know that Orleans taught his mistresses the art of fabricating pedigrees for their children. Mrs. Elliott spent the last two years of her life at Ville d'Avray, near Sèvres, where she lodged with the mayor, Dupuis. She died there 16 May 1823. The register, written by an illiterate hand, styles her Georgette instead of Grace, and gives her age as sixty-three.

[Journal of my Life, &c.; R. Bentley's Letter in the Times, 28 Jan. 1859; H. Walpole's Letters; Journal of Thomas Raikes; Diaries of Lord Malmesbury; Ville d'Avray Register.] J. G. A.

ELLIOTT, HENRY VENN (1792–1865), divine, born 17 Jan. 1792, was the son of Charles Elliott of Grove House, Clapham, by his second wife, Eling, daughter of Henry Venn, the well-known vicar of Huddersfield. Charles Elliott had eight children by his second marriage; Henry Venn was his eldest son and fourth child; other children were Charlotte Elliott [q. v.] and Edward Bishop Elliott [q. v.] Henry Venn was sent to school, under a Mr. Elwell of Hammersmith, when eight years old. In January 1809 he was transferred to the Rev. H. Jowett of Little Dunham, Norfolk. He went to Trinity College, Cambridge, in October 1810; became a scholar of his college in 1811; and graduated as fourteenth wrangler in 1814, winning also the second chancellor's medal. He was elected to a fellowship of Trinity in October 1816. He had suffered from overwork, and in July 1817 set out to recover his health by a foreign tour, which extended to Greece, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, a journey attended with some risk in those

days. In August 1820 he returned to England. He resided for a time at Cambridge, and was ordained deacon in November 1823 and priest in June 1824. After holding the curacy of Ampton, Suffolk, for two years, he returned to Cambridge in 1825. His father had now moved to Westfield Lodge, Brighton, and soon afterwards built the proprietary chapel of St. Mary's in that town. It was consecrated 18 Jan. 1827. Elliott was appointed the first preacher, and inherited the property upon his father's death, 15 Oct. 1832. For a few years previous to 1832 Elliott held also the priory of St. John's, Wilton, near Salisbury. He took pupils for a time, among whom were Sir Edward Fowell Buxton and the sons of Lord Aberdeen. He was afterwards fully occupied by his various duties. In 1832 he made proposals for the foundation of a school for the daughters of poor clergymen, in imitation of the school founded by his friend Carus Wilson at Cowan's Bridge, Yorkshire, in 1823. The school was opened as St. Mary's Hall on 1 Aug. 1836. Elliott himself gave liberal donations, many of them anonymously, and during the rest of his life took an active part in its management. In September 1849 the new church of St. Mark's, intended to provide for the district of Kemp Town and St. Mary's Hall, was opened, after many obstacles had been overcome by Elliott's energy and liberality. Elliott took a prominent part in providing for the religious needs of Brighton, then rapidly developing. He was a sincere evangelical, and especially anxious for the strict observance of Sunday. In 1852 he spoke at a public meeting against the proposal for opening the Crystal Palace on Sundays, and his remarks were taken to amount to a charge of venality against the 'Times' for defending the measure. He repudiated the intention, but was severely censured for his rash language.

On 31 Oct. 1833 Elliott married Julia, daughter of John Marshall of Hallsteads, Ulleswater. She was a lady of poetical talent, and some of her religious poems are given in Lord Selborne's 'Book of Praise.' She died of scarlet fever on 3 Nov. 1841, her fifth child, Julius, having been born on 24 Oct. preceding. Her death was followed by those of his mother, 16 April 1843, his favourite sister, Mary, three months later, and his eldest son, Henry Venn, a very promising lad, from the effects of a fall, on 2 June 1848. His second son, Charles Alfred, is now a distinguished member of the Indian civil service. Julius Marshall, the third son, was killed on the Schreckhorn 27 July 1869. Elliott died at Brighton on 24 Jan. 1865. He left two daughters.

His works consist of a number of separate sermons and a collection of hymns.

[Life by Josiah Bateman, 1868.]

ELLIOTT, JOHN, M.D. (*fl.* 1690), adherent of James II, was created M.D. of Cambridge by royal mandate in 1681 (*Cantabr. Graduati*, 1787, p. 129), and incorporated on that degree at Oxford 11 July 1683 (Wood, *Fasti Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, ii. 388, who describes Elliott as a member of Catherine Hall, Cambridge). Having been constituted a fellow of the Royal College of Physicians by the charter of James II, he was admitted as such 25 June 1687, and at the general election of officers for that year he was appointed censor. Elliott, who was one of the few admirers of James II, spoke openly of the Prince of Orange as a traitor and usurper. For publishing and dispersing on 10 June 1689 what purported to be 'A Declaration of His Most Sacred Majesty King James the Second, to all His Loving Subjects in the Kingdom of England,' 'given at Our Court in Dublin Castle the eighth day of May 1689 in the fifth year of our reign,' he, along with Sir Adam Blair, Captain Henry Vaughan, Captain Frederick Mole, and Robert Gray, M.D., was impeached by the commons of high treason and other crimes and offences, and committed to Newgate (*Commons' Journals*, x. 195–6). After appearing at the bar of the House of Lords, counsel were assigned him, and he was formally remanded, 4 July, to await his trial (*Lords' Journals*, xiv. 267). No trial, however, took place. He was detained in custody until 9 April 1690, when, by giving bail to the amount of 10,000*l.*, he regained his liberty (*ib.* xiv. 454, 456, 457). In the following December his bail was, upon his petition, ordered to be discharged. Elliott's name does not appear on the college list for 1693.

[Munk's Coll. of Phys. (1878), i. 474–5; Lords' Journals, xiv. 255–7, 264, 265, 266, 267, 276, &c.; Luttrell's Relation of State Affairs (1857), vols. i. ii.; Cat. of College of Physicians in Brit. Mus.] G. G.

ELLIOTT, Sir JOHN, M.D. (1736–1786), physician, son of a writer to the signet, was born in Edinburgh in 1736, and, after education under Nathaniel Jesse, became assistant to a London apothecary, and after a time sailed as surgeon to a privateer. Having obtained plenty of prize-money in this service, he determined to become a physician, graduated M.D. at St. Andrews 6 Nov. 1759, and was admitted a licentiate of the College of Physicians of London, 30 Sept. 1762. A brother Scot, Sir William Duncan, then

the king's physician, gave him help, and he soon made a large income. In 1776 he was knighted, was created a baronet 25 July 1778, and became physician to the Prince of Wales. When attending the prince during an illness in 1786 'Sir John Elliott told the queen that he had been preaching to the prince against intemperance as any bishop could have done;' to which the queen replied, 'And probably with like success' (Dr. Lort to Bishop Percy, 26 March 1786). On 19 Oct. 1771 he married Grace Dalrymple [see ELLIOTT, GRACE DALRYMPLE], who ran away with Lord Valentia in 1774. Elliott obtained 12,000*l.* damages. He lived in Great Marlborough Street, London. He died, 7 Nov. 1786, at Brocket Hall, Hertfordshire, the seat of his friend Lord Melbourne. He was buried in the parish church of Bishops Hatfield, and a tablet to his memory, with some lines by Jerningham on it, was put up by his uncle, William Davidson. He wrote 'The Medical Pocket-Book, containing a short but plain account of the Symptoms, Causes, and Methods of Cure of the Diseases incident to the Human Body,' London, 1781. It is a series of alphabetically arranged notes. They are nearly all taken from books, and show him to have made few medical observations. He thought millipedes good for scrofula. He says that he drew up the notes for his own use in practice, and they prove that the stores of medical knowledge in his mind were small indeed. His other works are altogether compilations. They are: 1. 'Philosophical Observations on the Senses of Vision and Hearing,' 1780. 2. 'Essays on Physiological Subjects,' 1780. 3. 'Address to the Public on a Subject of the utmost importance to Health,' 1780. 4. 'Fothergill's Works, with Life,' 1781. 5. 'An Account of the Principal Mineral Waters of Great Britain and Ireland,' 1781. 6. Elements of the Branches of Natural Philosophy connected with Medicine,' 1782.

[Munk's Coll. of Phys. 1878, ii. 239; Works; Burke's Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies of England, 1838, p. 181; Clutterbuck's History of the County of Hertford, 1821, ii. 371; Nichols's Lit. Illustrations, viii. 240–1; Notes and Queries, 3rd ser. x. 161–2.] N. M.

ELLIOTT or ELLIOT, WILLIAM (1727–1766), engraver, born at Hampton Court in 1727, resided in London in Church Street, Soho, and produced some good landscape engravings, remarkable for their taste and his free and graceful handling of the point. Great expectations were formed of him, but were frustrated by his early death in 1766, at the age of thirty-nine. According to Strutt, he was a man 'of an amiable and benevolent disposition, and greatly beloved by all who knew him.' His chief engravings are the so-called 'View in the Environs of Maestricht,' from the picture by A. Cuyp in the collection of the Marquis of Bute; a 'View of Tivoli' (companion to the above), from the picture by Rosa da Tivoli, in the collection of John Hadley, esq.; 'The Flight into Egypt,' after Poelemburg; 'Kilgarren Castle,' after R. Wilson; 'Spring' and 'Summer,' after J. van Goyen; 'The Setting Sun,' and other landscapes, after J. Pillement; 'The Town and Harbour of Sauzon,' after Serres, and other landscapes after Gaspar Poussin, Paul Sandby, and the Smiths of Chichester. In a series of engravings from drawings by Captain Hervey Smyth of events during the siege of Quebec by General Wolfe in 1759, Elliott engraved 'A View of the Fall of Montmorenci and the Attack made by General Wolfe on the French Intrenchments near Beauport, 31 July 1759.' He exhibited some of his engravings at the Society of Artists from 1761 to 1766.

[Strutt's Dict. of Engravers; Huber et Roost's Manuel des Curieux et des Amateurs de l'Art; Le Blanc's Manuel de l'Amateur d'Estampes; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Boydell's and Sayer's Catalogues.] L. C.

ELLIOTT, WILLIAM (*d.* 1792), lieutenant in the royal navy and marine painter, gained some repute from his paintings of the naval actions between 1780 and 1790. He first appears as an exhibitor in 1774 at the Free Society of Artists, with 'A Perspective View of the European Factory at Canton in China,' and 'A View of the Green, &c. at Calcutta in Bengal.' At the Royal Academy he first appears as an honorary exhibitor in 1784 with 'A Frigate and Cutter in Chase;' to the same exhibition he subsequently contributed 'The Fleet in Port Royal Harbour, Jamaica, after the Action of 12 June 1781' (1785), 'View of the City of Quebec' (1786), 'Breaking the French Line during Lord Rodney's Action on 12 April 1782' (1787), 'The Fire at Kingston, Jamaica, on 3 Feb. 1782' (1788), 'The Action between H.M.S. Quebec and Le Surveillant' and 'The Action between H.M.S. Serapis and Le Bonhomme' (1789). Elliott was a fellow of the Incorporated Society of Artists, and contributed seven pictures to their exhibition in 1790, and six to that in 1791, in which year he was president of the society. There are two pictures of the English fleet by him in the royal collection at Hampton Court. Elliott (then captain) died at Leeds on 21 July 1792. Some of his pictures were engraved, including 'The Dreadful Situation

of the Halsewell, East Indiaman, 6 Jan. 1786,' which he engraved in aquatint himself.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Catalogues of the Royal Academy, &c.; Nagler's Künstler-Lexikon; Gent. Mag., 1792, lxii. pt. ii. 866.] L. C.

ELLIOTT, Sir WILLIAM HENRY (1792–1874), general, son of Captain John Elliott, R.N., one of the comrades of Captain Cook in his second and third voyages, was born in 1792. He entered the army as an ensign in the 51st King's Own light infantry on 6 Dec. 1809. In January 1811 the 51st joined Lord Wellington's army while encamped within the lines of Torres Vedras, and Elliott's first battle was Fuentes de Onoro. He was present at the capture of Ciudad Rodrigo and of Badajoz, and at the battle of Salamanca, and was promoted lieutenant on 13 Aug. 1812. During the retreat from Burgos he acted as aide-de-camp to Colonel Mitchell, commanding the first brigade of the seventh division, and was wounded in conveying despatches under fire. In June 1813 he was appointed acting aide-de-camp to Major-general Inglis, and served with him at the battles of the Pyrenees, when he was again wounded, and at the Nivelle and Orthes. He was then appointed brigade-major to the first brigade, seventh division, in which capacity he served until the end of the war. Elliott was next present with the 51st at the battle of Waterloo, and he had charge of the scaling-ladders at the siege of Cambrai. He was promoted captain on 9 Nov. 1820. From 1821 to 1834 the 51st was stationed in the Ionian Islands, and Elliott, who never left his regiment, was promoted major on 12 July 1831. On 27 June 1838 he was promoted lieutenant-colonel, and he commanded the 51st in Australia, Van Diemen's Land, New Zealand, and at Bangalore, until 1852. In that year his regiment was ordered for service in the second Burmese war, and Elliott was detailed to command the Madras brigade in the first campaign. Under the superintendence of General Godwin, Elliott's brigade led the way in the fierce fighting of 10, 11, and 12 April 1852, in which Rangoon was captured, and in the storm of the Shwe-Dagon pagoda on 14 April. In the second campaign, which began in September 1852, Elliott again had command of a brigade, consisting of his own regiment and two battalions of Madras native infantry, and he co-operated successfully in the capture of Donabyú, the stronghold of the outlaw Myat-toon, who had but a short time before defeated Captain Loch. For these services he received a medal and clasp, was made a C.B., and made commandant at Rangoon. While there he discovered and suppressed on 20 Nov. 1853 a plot which had for its aim the destruction of all the English in Rangoon, and thus saved the city. In 1855 he gave up the colonelcy of the regiment which he had so long commanded, and on 20 Jan. 1857 he was promoted major-general. He never again went on active service, but he was made a K.C.B. in 1862, and appointed colonel of the 51st on 1 June in that year; he was promoted lieutenant-general on 27 July 1863, made a G.C.B. in 1870, and promoted general on 25 Oct. 1871. He died at his house, 20 Cambridge Square, London, on 27 Feb. 1874.

[Wheater's Record of the Services of the 51st Regiment; Laurie's Burmese Wars; Annual Register and London Gazettes for 1852–3; Times, 3 March 1874.] H. M. S.

ELLIS, ANTHONY (1690–1761), bishop of St. David's. [See Ellys.]

ELLIS, ARTHUR AYRES (1830–1887), Greek Testament critic, son of Charles Ellis of Birmingham, was born in 1830 at Birmingham, and educated at King Edward's School, under Dr. Lee. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, as a subsizar in 1848, graduated as ninth in the first class of the classical tripos in 1852, was elected fellow in 1854, and took the degree of M.A. in 1855. He was ordained soon afterwards, and filled the office of junior dean of his college, and that of divinity lecturer at Christ's College. In 1860 he was presented by Trinity College to the vicarage of Stotfold in Bedfordshire, where he remained till his death on 22 March 1887. While resident in college he gave a great deal of attention to Bentley's preparations for his edition of the Greek Testament, and in 1862 he published at Cambridge the volume entitled 'Bentleii Critica Sacra,' which contains a considerable portion of Bentley's notes extracted from his manuscripts in Trinity College Library, with the Abbé Rulotta's collation of the Vatican Codex (B), an edition of the 'Epistle to the Galatians,' given as a specimen of Bentley's intended edition, and an account of his collations.

[Personal knowledge.] H. R. L.

ELLIS, Sir BARROW HELBERT (1823–1887), Anglo-Indian, born in London 24 Jan. 1823, was son of S. Helbert Ellis, a prominent member of the Jewish community in London, by his wife, Fanny, daughter of Samuel Lyons de Symons. Educated at University College School, he matriculated at London University in 1839 and went to Haileybury. There he distinguished himself in all branches of study, and left in 1843 as senior student to enter the civil service of

Bombay. His first appointment in India was as third assistant-collector and magistrate of Ratnagiri; he was promoted to the post of second assistant in 1847, and in 1848 was made commissioner for investigating certain claims upon the Nizam's government. In 1851 he arrived in Sindh as assistant-commissioner, and from 1855 to 1857 was in charge of the offices of chief commissioner during the absence in England of Sir Bartle Frere. He was made special commissioner for jagirs or alienated lands in the province before leaving Sindh in 1858. In 1859 he was collector and magistrate at Broach, and, after serving as chief secretary of the Bombay government, was nominated an additional member in 1862 and an ordinary member in 1865 of the Bombay council. Five years later he was promoted to the viceroy's council. In 1875 he returned to England, and was made not only K.C.S.I. but a member of the Indian council in London. He retired in due course from the council, on whose deliberations he exerted much influence, in 1885. Ellis died at Evian-les-Bains, Savoy, on 20 June 1887, and was buried in the Jewish cemetery at Willesden, Middlesex, on 28 June following. He was an excellent revenue and settlement officer—'one of the ablest revenue officers of the Bombay Presidency,' in the words of Sir George Birdwood. While at Bombay Ellis was exceptionally popular with all classes of native Indians. He was at all times accessible to them, both in India and England, and the native newspapers eulogised him unstintedly at the time of his death. He left a sum of 2,500*l.* in trust for the poor of Ratnajiri, his first official charge. He was not married. On his retirement from India he took a prominent part in the affairs of the Jewish community of London, being vice-president of the Anglo-Jewish Association and of the Jews' College, where a portrait has been placed. Ellis published a report on education in Sindh (Bombay, 1856), and edited George Stack's 'Dictionary of Sindhi and English' (Bombay, 1855). He was an active member of the Royal Asiatic Society, which he joined in 1876. He founded a prize in Bombay University, and a scholarship there was established in his honour in 1875.

[Memoir by Sir George Birdwood in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, new ser. xix. 688; Times, 24 June 1887; Allen's Indian Mail, 28 June 1887; Jewish Chronicle (London), 24 June and 1 July 1887; Brit. Mus. Cat.; Times of India, 27 June 1887.]

ELLIS, CHARLES AUGUSTUS, Lord Howard de Walden and Seaford (1799–1868), diplomatist, elder son of Charles Rose Ellis, M.P. [q. v.], afterwards Lord Seaford, by Elizabeth Catherine Hervey, only daughter of John Augustus, eldest son of Frederick Augustus Hervey, earl of Bristol and Bishop of Derry, was born on 5 June 1799. On 8 July 1803 he succeeded his great grandfather, the Bishop of Derry, as Lord Howard de Walden. This title represented an ancient barony by writ, created by Queen Elizabeth in 1597, which had passed to the Bishop of Derry as representative through females of the younger daughter of the third Earl of Suffolk, and it now again passed by the female line to Charles Augustus Ellis, while the earldom of Bristol was inherited by the next male heir in the usual course. Lord Howard de Walden was educated at Eton, and on 4 April 1817 he entered the army as an ensign and lieutenant in the Grenadier guards. During the reductions in the strength of the army, made after the evacuation of France, Lord Howard de Walden was placed on half-pay on 25 Dec. 1818. He again entered the Grenadier guards on 6 Jan. 1820, but on 3 Oct. 1822 he was promoted captain in the 8th regiment and placed on half-pay. He took his seat in the House of Lords in 1820, and Canning, when he came into power on the death of the Marquis of Londonderry, showed every disposition to assist the relation of his dearest friend, George Ellis, and the son of one of his most trusted supporters, Charles Rose Ellis. In July 1824 Canning appointed Lord Howard de Walden under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, and in January 1826 sent him as attaché to Lord Stuart de Rothesay in his famous special mission to Rio de Janeiro. After his return from Brazil Lord Howard de Walden married, on 8 Nov. 1828, Lady Lucy Cavendish-Bentinck, fourth daughter of William Henry, fourth duke of Portland. On 2 Oct. 1832 he was appointed minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary to the court of Stockholm. On 22 Nov. 1833 he was transferred in the same capacity to Lisbon. During the thirteen years in which he held this appointment Lord Howard de Walden made his reputation as a diplomatist. He took up his duties while the civil war between the Miguelites and the Pedroites was still raging, and he remained to see more than one pronunciamiento in the streets of Lisbon and Oporto. The queen of Portugal and her advisers were greatly inclined to trust to the English minister, and his influence upon the Portuguese policy and the development of parliamentary government in that country is of the greatest importance in the internal history of Portugal during the present century. For his services to English diplomacy he was made a G.C.B. on 22 July 1838, and for his services to Portugal he was permitted

to receive and wear the grand cross of the Portuguese order of the Tower and Sword in 1841. On 10 Dec. 1846 Lord Howard de Walden, who in the July of the previous year had succeeded his father as second Lord Seaford, was appointed minister plenipotentiary at Brussels, and he remained at that court in that capacity for more than twenty years, enjoying the friendship both of Leopold I and Leopold II of Belgium. He died on 29 Aug. 1868 at his country château of Lesve, near Namur, leaving a family of six sons and two daughters.

[Foreign Office Lists; Foster's Peerage; obituary notices in Times and Illustrated London News, 12 Sept. 1868.] H. M. S.

ELLIS, CHARLES ROSE, first Lord Seaford (1771–1845), was the second son of John Ellis, who was himself second son of George Ellis, sometime chief justice of Jamaica, and descendant of Colonel John Ellis, who settled in that island in 1665, and founded a family there. He was born on 19 Dec. 1771, and, having inherited a large West India property, entered the House of Commons in March 1793, when barely of age, as M.P. for Heytesbury. He was not a brilliant speaker, but through his cousin, George Ellis [q. v.], who was Canning's intimate friend, he became acquainted with that statesman, of whom he remained a consistent follower until the end of his parliamentary career. In 1796 he was elected both for Wareham and Seaford, but preferred to sit for the latter place, and on 2 Aug. 1798 he married Elizabeth Catherine Clifton, only daughter and heiress of John, lord Hervey. About the same period he purchased the estate of Claremont in Surrey, where he exercised a large hospitality, and he was re-elected for Seaford in 1802. His wife died on 21 Jan. 1803, and on 8 July of that year his infant son, Charles Augustus Ellis, succeeded his maternal great-grandfather, Frederick Hervey, earl of Bristol and bishop of Derry, in the ancient barony of Howard de Walden (see Foster, *Peerage*). He lost his seat in 1806, but was elected for East Grinstead in 1807. He was re-elected for Seaford in 1812, and continued to represent that place until his elevation to the peerage in 1826. His importance in the House of Commons rested in his being the acknowledged head of what was known as the West Indian interest, and Canning often found his assistance of great value to him, though his chosen intimate was George Ellis, who was one of the recognised wits of the time, and whose untimely death in 1815 was universally lamented. In 1826 Canning was allowed to nominate a friend for a peerage, and he nominated Ellis, to the surprise of every one, according to Greville, and he was accordingly created Lord Seaford on 16 July 1826. Seaford died on 1 July 1845 at Wood End, near Chichester, and was succeeded in his peerage by his elder son, Lord Howard de Walden, a well-known diplomatist.

[Gent. Mag. October 1845.] H. M. S.

ELLIS, CLEMENT (1630–1700), divine and poet, was born at the episcopal palace of Rose Castle, Carlisle, Cumberland, in 1630. His father, Captain Philip Ellis, had been educated at Queen's College, Oxford, under the tuition of Dr. Barnaby Potter, who, on being raised to the see of Carlisle in March 1628, appointed his old pupil to be his steward. The bishop, who was godfather to Clement, died before the outbreak of the civil war, in January 1641–2, but Captain Ellis kept possession of Rose Castle for the king, and stood a siege for some considerable time. On the castle being taken he was imprisoned for twenty-six weeks and lost most of his estate (*Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1661–2, pp. 362, 621). Clement became a servitor of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1649, was afterwards a taberdar, and was elected a fellow in 1657 (*ib.* 1656–7, pp. 23, 51, 242, 1657–8, pp. 201, 216). He proceeded B.A. 2 Feb. 1653, M.A. 9 July 1656 (Wood, *Fasti Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, ii. 175, 193). While at Oxford he received several donations towards his subsistence, both before and after taking orders, from unknown hands, with anonymous letters informing him that those sums were in consideration of his father's sufferings, and to encourage his progress in his studies. After the Restoration he had reason to believe that he owed these gifts to Jeremy Taylor and Henry Hammond, as part of the funds entrusted to them for distribution among oppressed loyalists (Wordsworth, *Christian Biography*, 4th edit. iv. 358 *n*). Ellis thought it necessary to welcome Charles in some wretched lines addressed 'To the King's most excellent Majesty, on his happie and miraculous Return to the Government of his Three (now) flourishing Kingdoms,' fol., London, 1660, in which he frankly confessed himself to be 'much a better subject than a poet.' In 1661 he became domestic chaplain to William, marquis (afterwards duke) of Newcastle (*Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1660–1, p. 502), by whom he was subsequently presented to the rectory of Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottinghamshire. In 1693 he was installed a prebendary of Southwell on the presentation of Sharp, archbishop of York. Ellis died 28 June 1700, aged 70. Before 1665 he married Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Thomas

Remington of the East Riding of Yorkshire, by whom he had four sons and one daughter. His wife died in July 1691. Some of Ellis's religious writings, from their unaffected piety and homely vigour of style, enjoyed in their day considerable popularity. That by which he is still remembered is, 'The Gentile Sinner, or England's Brave Gentleman characterized in a Letter to a Friend, both as he is and as he should be,' 8vo, Oxford, 1660. Of this little work, which was written in a fortnight, seven editions were called for during the author's lifetime. Ellis wrote also: 1. 'Piæ Juventuti sacrum. An Elegy on the Death of the most virtuous and hopeful young Gentleman, George Pitt, esq.,' 4to, Oxford, 1658. 2. 'Sermon [on Ps. cxviii. 22, 23, 24], preached 29 May 1661, the Day of his Majesty's Birth and happy Restoration,' before William, marquis of Newcastle, in his house of Welbeck, 4to, Oxford, 1661. 3. 'The Vanity of Scoffing: in a Letter to a Witty Gentleman' (anon.), 4to, London, 1674. 4. 'Catechism, wherein the Learner is at once taught to rehearse and prove all the main Points of the Christian Religion,' &c., 8vo, London, 1674. (Republished, with additions and a life of the author by John Veneer, rector of St. Andrew's, Chichester, 8vo, 1738.) 5. 'Christianity in short; or, the Way to be a good Christian,' 12mo, London (1682). 6. 'The Right Foundation of Quietness, Obedience, and Concord, discovered in two seasonable Discourses [on Prov. xix. 21, and on Phil. ii. 3], shewing (1) The Folly of Man's Decrees. (2) The Stability of God's Counsel. (3) The Practice of true Humility,' 8vo, London, 1684. 7. 'The Communicant's Guide,' 12mo, London, 1685. 8. 'Rest for the Heavy-Laden; promised by . . . Jesus Christ to all sincere believers, practically discoursed upon,' 12mo, London, 1686. 9. 'A Letter to a Friend, reflecting on some Passages in a Letter [by John Sergeant] to the D[ean] of P[aul's, i. e. Edward Stillingfleet] in answer to the arguing part of his first Letter to Mr. G[ooden, which is signed E. S., i. e. Edward Stillingfleet]' (anon.), 4to, London, 1687. 10. 'The Reflecters Defence of his Letter to a Friend [concerning the conference between Edward Stillingfleet and Peter Gooden] against the furious assaults of Mr. J[ohn] S[ergeant] in his second Catholic Letter. In four Dialogues (between J. S., a Roman Catholick, and C., a Catholick Christian)' (anon.), 4to, London, 1688. 11. 'The Protestant Resolved; or, a Discourse shewing the unreasonableness of his turning Roman Catholic for Salvation' (anon.), 4to, London, 1688 (reprinted in vol. i. of 'A Preservative against Popery,' fol., London, 1738, in vol. iv. of the 1848 edition, 8vo, and in vol. iii. of Cardwell's 'Enchiridion,' 8vo, 1837). 12. 'Religion and Loyalty inseperable. A Sermon [on Prov. xxiv. 21] preached at the assizes held at Nottingham, 5 Sept. 1690,' 4to, London, 1691. 13. 'The Necessity of serious Consideration and Speedy Repentance, as the only way to be safe, both living and dying,' 8vo, London, 1691. 14. 'The Folly of Atheism demonstrated to the capacity of the most unlearned Reader,' 8vo, London, 1692. 15. 'The Lambs of Christ fed with sincere Milk of the Word, in a short Scripture Catechism,' 8vo, London, 1692. 16. 'The Christian Hearer's first Lesson. A sermon [on 1 Cor. iii. 7] preached at St. Mary's Church in Nottingham, 4 Oct. 1694,' 4to, London, 1694. 17. 'The Sum of Christianity,' 3rd edit., 8vo, London, 1703 (reprinted in vol. i. of Wordsworth's 'Christian Institutes,' 8vo, 1839). 18. 'Three Discourses; one on the Parable of Dives and Lazarus [Luke xvi. 19–31]; the second on that of the Unjust Steward [Luke xvi. 1–9], and the third on that of the Ten Virgins [Matt. xxv. 1–12]. With a Preface, giving some account of the Author's Writings and Life' (edited by Thomas Ellis, the son), 8vo, London, 1704. 19. 'The Self-Deceiver plainly discover'd to himself, or the serious Christian instructed in his duty to God . . . In some private Conferences between a minister and his Parishioner,' 8vo, London, 1731. Ellis likewise compiled a grammar for the use of his children, entituled 'Magnum in Parvo, an English guide to the Latin Tongue.' According to Noble his portrait at the age of sixty-eight was prefixed to his 'Three Discourses' (*Continuation of Granger*, ii. 141; Granger, *Biog. Hist. of England*, 2nd ed., iii. 299–300).

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), iv. 516–17; Veneer's Life; Granger's Letters, p. 133.] G. G.

ELLIS, Rev. EDMUND (*fl.* 1707). [See Elys.]

ELLIS, EDWIN (1844–1878), musician, received his professional training from his father, and appeared when a boy of seven as solo violinist at Cremorne Gardens. He joined the orchestras of the Princess's and Adelphi theatres, becoming general musical director at the Adelphi about 1867, and composing a great quantity of music suitable to the dramas given there. Ellis also did some good work with the band of the Queen's Theatre, Liverpool, whither he had been sent for change of air. His health, however, did not improve, and he died aged 35, at St. Thomas's Hospital, 20 Oct. 1878. In a letter

to the 'Era' of 10 Nov. the same year, Charles Reade paid a cordial tribute to the memory of this 'dramatic musician and amiable man,' recalling to the mind of the playgoing public the vigilant delicacy with which Ellis accompanied a mixed scene of action and dialogue. His published compositions consisted of selections for small orchestra from Flotow's 'Alessandro Stradella,' Thomas's 'Caïd,' and Offenbach's 'Belle Hélène,' besides a few songs to words by Mr. Blanchard and others.

[Athenæum, 1878, ii. 697; Era, 1878, 41, 2094; printed music in the British Museum Library; private information.] L. M. M.

ELLIS, FRANCIS WHYTE (*d.* 1819), orientalist, became a writer in the East India Company's service at Madras in 1796. He was promoted to the offices of assistant-under secretary, deputy-secretary, and secretary to the board of revenue in 1798, 1801, and 1802 respectively. In 1806 he was appointed judge of the zillah of Masulipatam; in 1809 collector of land customs in the Madras presidency, and in 1810 collector of Madras. He died at Ramnad of cholera on 10 March 1819. Ellis made his reputation as a Tamil and Sanskrit scholar. About 1816 he printed at Madras a small portion of 'The Sacred Kurral of Tiruvalluva-Nâyanâr,' with an English translation and elaborate commentary (304 pp.) The Rev. Dr. G. U. Pope, who issued a new edition of the 'Sacred Kurral' in 1886, and reprinted Ellis's as well as Beschi's versions, described Ellis as 'an oriental scholar of extraordinary ability.' To the 'Asiatic Researches' (vol. xiv. Calcutta) Ellis contributed an account of a large collection of Sanskrit manuscripts found at Pondicherry. These were shown to be compositions of Jesuit missionaries, who had embodied under the title of 'Vedas' their religious doctrines and much legendary history in classical Sanskrit verse, with a view to palming them off on the natives of the Dekhan as the work of the Rishis and Munis, the inspired authors of their scriptures. According to Professor Wilson Ellis also wrote 'three valuable dissertations on the Tamil, Telugu, and Malayalim languages.' The Telugu dissertation was printed in A. D. Campbell's 'Telugu Grammar' (1816?). Manuscript notes survive to show that in early life Ellis tried to trace analogies between the South Indian and Hebrew languages. Among his papers is a marvellously skilful explanation of the Travancore inscription, the oldest specimen of the Tamil language in existence.

Ellis was deeply interested in the history and social condition of the natives of India, and was an expert on both subjects. 'A reply [by Ellis] to the first seventeen questions stated in a letter from the secretary to government in the revenue department, dated 2 Aug. 1814, relative to Mirâsi right,' is one of the three treatises on Mirâsi right printed by Charles Philip Brown [q. v.] in his volume on the subject issued in 1852. In 1828 Ellis drew up a paper entitled 'Desiderata and Enquiries connected with the Presidency of Madras,' which was widely circulated after it had been translated into all the vernaculars. It dealt with the collection of information on all subjects, from 'language and literature' to arts, manufactures, and natural history. Ellis left his papers—philological and political—to Sir Walter Elliot, on whose death they passed to Dr. Pope. Dr. Pope has placed them in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

[Prinsep's Madras Civilians, 1886; Rev. G. U. Pope's Sacred Kurral, 1886; Brit. Mus. Cat.; Prof. H. H. Wilson in Imp. Dict. of Biog.; Athenæum, 1875, i. 489; information from the Rev. Dr. Pope of Oxford.]

ELLIS, GEORGE (1753–1815), author, the only and posthumous son of George Ellis (*d.* 1753), member of the house of assembly of St. George (Grenada, West Indies), by Susanna Charlotte, daughter of Samuel Long, member of the council of Jamaica, was born in 1753. He made his début in literature as the author of some mock heroic couplets on Bath, its beauties and amusements, published anonymously in 1777, 4to. In 1778 appeared 'Poetical Tales by Sir Gregory Gander,' a 12mo volume which was at once attributed to Ellis and had much vogue. Horace Walpole calls the tales 'pretty verses' (*Letter to the Earl of Strafford*, 24 June 1783). Sir Gilbert Elliot, first earl of Minto, had 'never read anything so clever, so lively, and so light.' Years afterwards Scott refers to them in the introduction to the fifth canto of 'Marmion,' which is addressed to Ellis. In 1783 Horace Walpole (ut supra) notes as a sign of the anglomania prevailing in France that Ellis was 'a favourite' at Versailles. Ellis was one of the contributors to the 'Rolliad,' and in particular is said to have written the severe attack on Pitt beginning 'Pert without fire, without experience sage,' in the second number of the first part. In December 1784 he accompanied Sir James Harris, afterwards Lord Malmesbury, on his mission to the Hague, and was employed by him in diplomatic business, thus gaining an insight into the secret springs of the Dutch revolution of 1785–7, of which he wrote a history, published anonymously in 1789, and translated by 'Monsieur,' afterwards Louis XVIII,

into French. A 'Memoir of a Map of the Countries comprehended between the Black Sea and the Caspian,' published anonymously in 1788, has also been ascribed to Ellis. In 1790 he published a volume of selections from our early poetical literature, entitled 'Specimens of the Early English Poets,' which obtained a well-merited reputation as one of the most judicious of such compilations. It was issued in an enlarged form, with an historical sketch of the progress of English poetry prefixed, in 1801, and again in 1803, 3 vols. 8vo; a fourth edition appeared in 1811, a fifth in 1845, a sixth in 1851. In 1791 Ellis made a tour in Germany and Italy with Lord and Lady Malmesbury. He entered parliament in 1796 as junior member for Seaford, one of the Cinque ports, his cousin, Charles Rose Ellis [q. v.], afterwards Baron Seaford, being the senior member. He never spoke in the house, and did not stand for re-election. He accompanied Lord Malmesbury to the conference at Lille in 1797, and wrote a long letter to Canning defending the English plenipotentiary's conduct of the negotiations. Shortly after his return to England he was introduced to Pitt, and in concert with Canning founded the 'Anti-Jacobin.' His connection with the 'Rolliad,' however, though condoned, was not forgotten, and once in Pitt's presence he was pressed to give some account of it. He hesitated and showed some embarrassment, which Pitt promptly dispelled by the urbane and gracious manner in which he turned to him with the words of Dido to Æneas: 'Immo age, et a prima dic, hospes, origine nobis' (*Æn.* i. 753). Ellis appears to have been a constant contributor to the 'Anti-Jacobin.' He also edited in 1796, with a preface, notes, and appendix, Gregory Lewis Way's translations of select 'Fabliaux' of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, taken from the collection of Legrand d'Aussy; a second edition appeared in 1800, and a third in 1815, 3 vols. 8vo. In 1801 he made the acquaintance of Scott, an acquaintance which soon ripened into an intimacy only terminated by death. A portion of the voluminous correspondence which passed between them will be found in Lockhart's 'Life of Scott,' from which also we learn that on his visits to London Scott was accustomed to stay with Ellis at his house at Sunninghill, near Ascot. 'Mr. Ellis,' says Scott, 'was the first converser I ever knew; his patience and good breeding made me often ashamed of myself going off at score upon some favourite topic' (*Diary*, 29 Aug. 1826). In 1805 Ellis published 'Specimens of Early English Romances in Metre,' 3 vols. 8vo, a second edition of which appeared in 1811, 3 vols. cr. 8vo. The work was also edited by J. O. Halliwell, F.R.S., in 1848. Ellis wrote the review of the 'Lady of the Lake' in the 'Quarterly Review,' May 1811. He began, but did not live to finish, an edition of the diary of his friend William Windham. The introductory sketch of Windham was, however, complete, and will be found in Mrs. Henry Baring's edition of the diary, published in 1866. Ellis was a fellow of the Royal Society and of the Society of Antiquaries. His labours on the early poetical dramatic literature of England obtained for him the designation of the Tressan and the St. Palaye of England. He married on 10 Sept. 1800 Anne, daughter of Sir Peter Parker, first baronet of Basingbourn, admiral of the fleet, and died without issue on 10 April 1815.

[Burke's Peerage (Howard de Walden—family of Ellis); Life and Letters of Sir Gilbert Elliot, first Earl of Minto, i. 189–90, 388–402; Lists of Members of Parliament (Official Return of); Diaries and Corresp. of the first Earl of Malmesbury, iii. 429 et seq.; Gent. Mag. 1815, pt. i. p. 371; Brit. Mus. Cat.; Lond. Libr. Cat.]

J. M. R.

ELLIS, GEORGE JAMES WELBORE AGAR-, first Baron Dover (1797–1833), was the only son of Henry Welbore Agar-Ellis, second Viscount Clifden, by his wife, Lady Caroline Spencer, eldest daughter of George, third duke of Marlborough. He was born in Upper Brook Street, London, on 14 Jan. 1797, and was sent as a town boy to Westminster School in 1811, but did not remain there long. He afterwards went to Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. on 27 June 1816, and M.A. on 21 April 1819. At the general election in June 1818, shortly after he had completed his twenty-first year, Agar-Ellis was elected to parliament as one of the members for the borough of Heytesbury. In March 1820 he was returned for Seaford, and on 30 April 1822 he seconded Canning's motion for leave to bring in a bill to relieve the Roman catholic peers from the disabilities then imposed upon them with regard to the right of sitting and voting in the House of Lords (*Parl. Debates*, new ser. vii. 214). In a discussion on the estimates for the grant to the British Museum in July 1823 Agar-Ellis stated his intention of moving for a grant in the next session to be applied to the purchase of the Angerstein collection of pictures, and towards the formation of a national gallery (*ib.* ix. 1359). The government, however, adopted his suggestion, and in the following year the collection was purchased for 60,000*l.* (*ib.* xi. 101). These pictures, which were thirty-eight in number, were selected chiefly by Sir Thomas

Lawrence, and, together with those which had been presented by Sir G. Beaumont, formed the nucleus of the collection now in Trafalgar Square. At the general election in June 1826 Agar-Ellis was returned for the borough of Ludgershall, and in March 1827 spoke in the House of Commons in favour of the petition of the Roman catholic bishops of Ireland (*ib.* xvi. 793–5). In July 1830 he was elected one of the members for Okehampton. Upon Lord Grey becoming prime minister in the place of the Duke of Wellington, Agar-Ellis was sworn a member of the privy council on 22 Nov. 1830, and was appointed chief commissioner of woods and forests by patent dated 13 Dec. 1830. He was, however, compelled by ill-health to resign this office within two months of his appointment, and was succeeded by Viscount Duncannon on 11 Feb. 1831. Agar-Ellis was created Baron Dover in the peerage of the United Kingdom on 20 June 1831, and died at Dover House, Whitehall, on 10 July 1833, in his thirty-seventh year. He was buried in the family vault in St. Mary's Church, Twickenham, on the 17th of the same month. Though he did not take a very conspicuous part in the debates on the great political questions of the day, he was a consistent supporter of liberal principles, as well as an earnest advocate of everything which tended to the improvement of the people. He was a generous patron of the fine arts, and formed a valuable collection of paintings by English artists. In the review of his edition of Walpole's 'Letters' Macaulay wrote: 'The editing of these volumes was the last of the useful and modest services rendered to literature by a nobleman of amiable manners, of untarnished public and private character, and of cultivated mind' (*Edinburgh Review*, October 1833, p. 227).

He was a trustee of the British Museum and of the National Gallery, a commissioner of the public records, and a member of several learned societies. In 1832, upon the resignation of Thomas Burgess [q.v.], the bishop of Salisbury, Dover was elected president of the Royal Society of Literature. He married at Chiswick, on 7 March 1822, Lady Georgiana Howard, second daughter of George, sixth earl of Carlisle, by whom he had four sons and three daughters. His widow survived him many years, and died, aged 55, on 17 March 1860. He was succeeded in the barony of Dover by his eldest son, Henry, who, upon the death of his grandfather on 13 July 1836, also became third Viscount Clifden and third Baron Mendip. A portrait of Dover, by Sir Thomas Lawrence, was exhibited at the British Gallery in 1833. An engraving by E. Scriven, after another portrait by T. Phillips, R.A., was published in Fisher's 'National Portrait Gallery,' and a mezzotint by W. Ward, A.R.A., after a portrait by John Jackson, R.A., was published in 1833. Besides several articles in the 'Edinburgh' and 'Quarterly' Reviews, as well as in the annuals and other magazines, Dover wrote the following works: 1. 'Catalogue of the Principal Pictures in Flanders and Holland' (anon.), London, 1822, 8vo. 2. 'The True History of the State Prisoner, commonly called The Iron Mask, extracted from documents in the French archives,' London, 1826, 8vo. It was afterwards translated into French and published in Paris in 1830. 3. 'Historical Inquiries respecting the Character of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, Lord Chancellor of England,' London, 1827, 8vo. 4. 'The Ellis Correspondence. Letters written during the years 1686, 1687, 1688, and addressed to John Ellis, Esq., Secretary to the Commissioners of His Majesty's Revenue in Ireland. . . . Edited from the originals, with notes and a preface, by the Hon. George Agar Ellis,' London, 1829, 8vo, 2 vols. 5. 'Life of Frederick the Second, King of Prussia,' London, 1832, 8vo, 2 vols. 6. 'Dissertation on the Manner and Period of the Death of Richard II, King of England,' &c., London, 1832, 4to. 7. 'Dissertation on the Gowrie Conspiracy, 1600,' &c., London, 1833, 4to. 8. 'Letters of Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, to Sir Horace Mann, British Envoy at the Court of Tuscany. Now first published from the originals in the possession of the Earl of Waldegrave. Edited [with sketch of the life of Horace Walpole] by Lord Dover,' London, 1833, 8vo, 3 vols. 9. 'Lives of Eminent Sovereigns of Modern Europe.' This was written by Lord Dover for his son. It was left in manuscript and published after the author's death. The fourth edition is dated 1853, London, 12mo.

[Alumni Westmon. (1852), p. 408; Cat. of Oxford Graduates (1851), p. 211; Pedigree in the Ellis Correspondence (1829), i. xxiii; Gent. Mag. 1797, vol. lxvii. pt. i. p. 163, 1822, vol. xcii. pt. i. p. 272, 1833, vol. ciii. pt. ii. pp. 177–8, 1836 (new ser.), vi. 219, 1860 (new ser.), viii. 527; Cobbett's Memorials of Twickenham (1872), p. 78; Burke's Peerage (1886), p. 298; Haydn's Book of Dignities (1851), pp. 143, 194; London Gazettes for 1830, pt. ii. pp. 2449, 2539; Official Return of Lists of Members of Parliament, pt. ii. pp. 279, 294, 308, 317; Allibone's Dict. of Eng. Lit. (1859), i. 553; Martin's Bibl. Cat. of Privately Printed Books (1854), pp. 277, 422; Brit. Mus. Cat.] G. F. R. B.

ELLIS, HENRY (1721-1806), traveller, hydrographer, and colonial governor, returned from Italy in 1746, just in time to find an

expedition to search for a north-west passage on the point of sailing. Of his antecedents we know nothing, except that he speaks of himself as at that time 'accustomed to a seafaring life,' but 'without experience of northern seas and northern climates,' and some years later as 'having traversed a great part of the globe' (*Annual Register*, 1760, p. 92). He appears to have been in easy circumstances; his name stands in the list of subscribers to the north-west expedition, and he had sufficient interest to get attached to it, nominally as agent for the committee, and really as hydrographer, surveyor, and mineralogist. The expedition, consisting of two vessels, the Dobbs galley of 180 and California of 150 tons, left Gravesend on 20 May 1746, joined the Hudson's Bay convoy in Hollesley Bay, and finally sailed from Yarmouth on the 31st. They parted from the convoy on 18 June, made Resolution Island on 8 July, and after a tedious passage through Hudson's Straits rounded Cape Digges on 8 Aug., and on the 11th 'made the land on the west side the Welcome, in lat. 64° N.' Bad weather drove them to the southward, and prevented their doing anything more that season. They wintered in Hayes River, in a creek about three miles above Fort York, where a quarrel with the agent of the Hudson's Bay Company gave an unwonted piquancy to the dark and weary days. They suffered much from scurvy, the prevalence of which Ellis attributes to their having got two kegs of brandy from Fort York for their Christmas merrymaking, and in a minor degree to the 'governor' not permitting the Indians to supply them with fresh provisions. On 29 May 1747 the ice broke up, and they were able to warp to the mouth of their creek; on 9 June they got down to Fort York. There they were allowed to get some provisions and stores, and on the 24th cleared the river and 'stood to the northward on the discovery.'. On 1 July each of the two ships sent away her long-boat, but, owing apparently to some ill-feeling between the two captains, without any prearranged plan for working in concert. The consequence was that they separately went over the same ground, discovering, naming, and examining the several creeks and inlets on the west side of Hudson's Bay, the double examination perhaps compensating for the confusion arising from the double naming. Before the season closed in they had satisfied themselves that the only possible exit from Hudson's Bay on the west must be through the Welcome, and that very probably there was no way out except that on the east, by which they had come in. The result may not seem much; but as it served to put an end to the idea that the passage must lie through Hudson's Bay it was, at least, so much gain to accurate knowledge. After 21 Aug. the weather broke, and they decided in council 'to bear away for England without further delay.' On the 29th they entered Hudson's Straits, passed Resolution Island on 9 Sept., and arrived at Yarmouth on 14 Oct. Ellis's share in the work of the expedition had really been very slender, but the reputation of it has been commonly assigned to him by reason of the narrative which he published the following year under the title 'A Voyage to Hudson's Bay, by the Dobbs Galley and California in the years 1746 and 1747, for Discovering a North-West Passage' (8vo, 1748); a work which with many valuable observations on tides, on the vagaries of the compass, and on the customs of the Eskimos, a people then practically unknown, mingles a great deal of speculation on the certain existence of the passage, on magnetism, on fogs, on rust, and other matters, all more or less ingenious, but now known to be wildly erroneous. Such as it was, the book commended its author to the scientific workers of the day, and on 8 Feb. 1748–9 he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society. Possibly in acknowledgment (as is said) of his scientific labours, but more probably by some family interest, he was afterwards appointed successively governor of Georgia and of Nova Scotia, from which employment he retired about 1770. He seems to have spent his later years as a wanderer on the continent, was at Marseilles in 1775, and died at Naples on 21 Jan. 1806.

Besides his 'Narrative of the North-West Voyage,' he wrote in a separate form 'Considerations on the Great Advantages which would arise of the North-West Passage' (Lond. 1750, 4to), and contributed papers to the 'Philosophical Transactions' on 'Dr. Hale's Ventilators,' on 'Temperature of the Sea' (1751), and on 'Heat of the Weather in Georgia' (1758); the last of which is reprinted in the 'Annual Register' for 1760.

[Ellis's works, as above; Account of a Voyage to the North-West, &c., by the Clerk of the California (Lond. 1748, 2 vols. 8vo), is another and to some extent antagonistic narrative; Biographie Universelle; Allgemeine Encyclopädie.]

J. K. L.

ELLIS, Sir HENRY (1777–1855), diplomatist, was born in 1777, and at an early age entered upon a public career. After performing various minor services, in 1814 he was sent out to Persia as minister plenipotentiary *ad interim*, and returned from that country in the following year, having success-

fully negotiated a treaty of peace. In 1816 he accompanied Earl Amherst in his embassy to China, in the capacity of third commissioner. A mission to China was then so rare an event in the history of Europe, that Ellis published in 1817 an authorised narrative of the journey and transactions of the embassy [see AMHERST, WILLIAM PITT]. On their return from China in the Alceste, Amherst and Ellis were wrecked. They were forced to make for Java in an open boat, and reached Batavia after a perilous voyage of several hundred miles. Ellis reported that an impression could only be produced at Pekin by a knowledge of the strength of England, rather than by pompous embassies. Ellis held the office of clerk of the pells from 1825 until the abolition of that office in 1834; and he was appointed one of the commissioners of the board of control in 1830, which office he held for five years. In 1830 he issued a 'Series of Letters on the East India Question,' addressed to the members of the two houses of parliament. In the earlier part of his career Ellis had been for six years in the civil service of the East India Company; and at the Bengal presidency he held the post of private secretary to the president of the board of control when the acts regulating the territorial government and trade of the East India Company were passed (1812–14). He had thus much experience of the subject, and recommended the abandonment of exclusive privileges by the company and a considerate treatment of the company by the English government. In July 1835 Ellis was appointed ambassador to Persia, but he relinquished that appointment in November of the following year. He was despatched on an extraordinary and special mission to the Brazils in August 1842, and at the close of 1848 he was appointed by the British government to attend the conference at Brussels on the affairs of Italy. Ellis was made a privy councillor in 1832, and in 1848 was created a K.C.B. On his retirement from the diplomatic service he was awarded a pension of 1,400*l.* per annum, together with a second pension for the abolished office of clerk of the pells. He died at Brighton, 28 Sept. 1855.

[Ann. Reg. 1855; Gent. Mag. 1855; Ellis's works cited above.] G. B. S.

ELLIS, SIR HENRY (1777–1869), principal librarian of the British Museum, born in London on 29 Nov. 1777, was educated at Merchant Taylors' School, where his brother, the Rev. John Joseph Ellis, was assistant-master for forty years. In 1796, having gained one of the Merchant Taylors' exhibitions at St. John's College, he matriculated at Oxford, and in 1798, by the interest of his friend Price, Bodleian librarian, was appointed one of the two assistants in the Bodleian Library, the other being his subsequent colleague in the museum, the Rev. H. H. Baber. In the same year he published at the age of twenty-one his 'History of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, and Liberty of Norton Folgate,' an earnest of the laborious industry and the zeal for antiquarian pursuits which were to distinguish him all his life. He took the degree of B.C.L. in 1802. He was a fellow of St. John's till 1805. In 1800 he was appointed a temporary assistant in the library of the British Museum, and in 1805 he became assistant-keeper of printed books under the Rev. W. Beloe. The unfortunate robbery of prints which cost Beloe his appointment in the following year [see BELOE, WILLIAM; DIGHTON, ROBERT] raised Ellis most unexpectedly to the headship of the department, Baber, his former senior at the Bodleian, becoming his assistant. His promotion coincided with a period of increased activity at the museum. Already, in 1802, three attendants had been appointed to relieve the officers of the duty of conducting visitors over the establishment; and in 1807 the trustees, finding that this relief had not occasioned any remarkable increase of official labour, took serious steps to expedite the compilation of new and more accurate catalogues. The printed catalogue of the library was at that time comprised in two folio volumes, full of inaccuracies, but provided with a manuscript supplement, and to a considerable extent revised and corrected in manuscript by Beloe's predecessor, the Rev. S. Harper. Ellis and Baber commenced their work of reconstruction in March 1807, and completed it in December 1819. The length of the operation may be partly accounted for by Ellis's transfer to the department of manuscripts in 1812; he continued, however, to attend to the catalogue for some time afterwards, and completed the portion he had originally undertaken, being from A to F and from P to R inclusive, Baber doing all the rest. According to his own statement he derived great assistance from the learned Bishop Dampier; his portion of the catalogue, nevertheless, has been most severely criticised by his successor Panizzi; and it cannot be denied that errors have been pointed out damaging not only to his character for scholarship, but to his better established reputation for industry. It must be remembered, on the other hand, that the standard of catalogue-making was by no means high at the period, that Ellis worked nearly single-handed, and that his catalogue is, after all, a great improvement on its predecessor, and

is even now, from its simplicity and brevity, frequently found useful by visitors to the reading-room. He had meanwhile, besides removing to the manuscripts department, accepted (1814) the then almost sinecure office of secretary to the museum, and in the same year he became secretary to the Society of Antiquaries. His diligence in this post was most exemplary; during the forty years for which he held it he only missed two meetings, and his contributions to the 'Archæologia' are exceedingly numerous. His catalogue of the society's manuscripts was published in 1816; in the same year he edited the 'Additamenta' to Domesday Book. His general introduction to this national record, written in 1813, was published in a separate form in 1833. It is unquestionably the most valuable of his antiquarian labours, and a work of very great importance. He also, in conjunction with Caley and others, edited Dugdale's 'Monasticon' between 1817 and 1833, and turned his position as head of the manuscript department to account in the publication of 'Original Letters illustrative of English History,' mostly drawn from originals in the museum. Three series of this invaluable collection appeared, in 1824, 1827, and 1846 respectively. The first is in three volumes, the others each in four. None of his publications is so well known, and it is as important to the historical student as delightful to the general reader. He also drew up, as secretary, several useful guides to the various departments of the museum. In 1827 Planta, the principal librarian [q. v.], died, and Ellis, who had for nine years taken a large share of his duties, naturally expected to succeed him. When, however, in compliance with the act of parliament, two names for the vacancy were submitted to the crown, that of Henry Fynes Clinton [q. v.], the renowned chronologist, a protégé of Archbishop Manners Sutton, was placed before Ellis. It is said that Ellis was actually named first, but that an unauthorised change was effected. It is also said that Ellis obtained redress by pursuing the carriage of the royal physician, Sir William Knighton, and enlisting his good offices with the king. It is certain that for the only time in the history of the museum the name first submitted was set aside, and that Ellis obtained the office, 20 Dec. 1827. In 1833 he was made a knight of Hanover by William IV, an honour which he shared with Herschel, Madden, and other men of eminence. The museum, unfortunately, was then at a low ebb, both as regarded public favour and public usefulness. Ellis, who might have presided creditably over an institution which he had found in a high state of efficiency, was not the man to raise it out of a low one. His administrative faculties, which had served him well during a period of mere routine, were inadequate to cope with the rapidly augmenting demands of the country and the inevitable, almost involuntary, increase of the institution. His views, though natural enough at the beginning of the century, seemed strangely illiberal in the era of the Reform Bill; he told the parliamentary committee of 1835 that if the museum were not closed for three weeks in the autumn, 'the place would positively become unwholesome,' and that it would never do to open it on Saturdays, when 'the most mischievous part of the population was abroad.' He possessed, indeed, few qualifications for the chief office except industry and kindness of heart, and the latter very essential quality certainly went too far with him. After the revelations of the parliamentary committee of 1835–6 the trustees could but recognise the necessity for a thorough change of management, which they endeavoured to obtain by devolving the most laborious of the principal librarian's duties on the secretary, who suddenly became the most important officer in the museum. During his ascendency, Ellis, though as ever industrious, active, loquacious, and seemingly unconscious of any change in his position, was virtually superseded as chief officer; and when the committee of 1848–9 made an end of this anomalous state of things by uniting the offices of secretary and principal librarian, the time for any effectual exercise of authority on his part had long gone by. Panizzi was the real ruler of the museum, and it says much for Ellis's placability that he should have so cordially accepted the direction of one who had assailed him with a contemptuous acerbity which would have been inconceivable if the condition of the museum at the time had not been absolutely anarchical. Excellent health and the absence of any machinery for compulsory retirement kept Ellis at his post until February 1856, when he resigned on a pension, and lived thirteen years more almost in the shadow of the museum, full of geniality, urbanity, and anecdote to the last. He died at his house in Bedford Square 15 Jan. 1869, leaving behind him the character of a diligent antiquary and an amiable man, who could scarcely be blamed if the altered circumstances of his times rendered him unequal to a post which at an earlier period he would have filled with distinction.

[Obituary notices in Athenæum, Notes and Queries, and Illustrated News; Edwards's Founders of the British Museum; Robinson's

History of Merchant Taylors' School; Reports of British Museum Committees, 1835 and 1849.]
R. G.

ELLIS, SIR HENRY WALTON (1783–1815), colonel, was son of Major-general Joyner Ellis, and grandson of J. Joyner of Berkeley, Gloucestershire. Major-general Joyner Ellis took the name Ellis in consequence of his adoption by 'Governor' Henry Ellis [q. v.], lieutenant-governor of Georgia, 1758, who resided for some time at Lansdowne Place, Bath, and died at Naples in 1806. Joyner Ellis served successively in the 18th, old 89th, and 41st foot, became lieutenant-colonel 23rd royal Welsh fusileers in 1793, major-general 1798, and died 1804. He represented the city of Worcester in parliament for some years. By his wife, whose maiden name was Walton, he had several children, the eldest of whom, Henry Walton Ellis, was born at Worcester in 1783, and immediately appointed to an ensigncy in the 89th foot, of which Joyner Ellis was major. The regiment, which had been chiefly recruited about Worcester, was disbanded at the peace a few months later, and the baby was put on half-pay; but brought on full pay again as an ensign, at the age of five, in the 41st foot, of which Joyner Ellis had been appointed major on its reorganisation in 1787. Young Ellis became a lieutenant 41st foot in 1792, and captain 23rd fusileers 20 Jan. 1796. Joining the latter corps, a boy-captain of barely fourteen, he served with it in the descent on Ostend in 1798, in North Holland in 1799 (wounded), in the Channel, at Ferrol and in the Mediterranean in 1800, in Egypt in 1801 (wounded, gold medal and rank of major), in Hanover in 1805, and at Copenhagen in 1807. A youthful veteran of twenty-five, he succeeded to the command of the first battalion of his regiment, without purchase, in Nova Scotia in 1808, and commanded it in the expedition against Martinique in 1809, where at the siege of Fort Bourbon he offered to take the flints out of his men's firelocks and carry the works with his fusileers at the point of the bayonet, a daring enterprise, which the commander-in-chief, Sir George Beckwith [q. v.], refused to sanction (see CANNON, *Hist. Rec. 23rd Fusileers*, pp. 132–134). He proceeded with his battalion to Portugal in 1810, and commanded it through the succeeding campaigns in the Peninsula and south of France, during which he repeatedly distinguished himself, particularly at Albuhera on the occasion of the historic charge of the fusileer brigade, at the siege of Badajos in 1812 (wounded), and in the desperate fighting at the pass of Roncesvalles, in the Pyrenees, 28 July 1813 (*ib.* pp. 146–147). For his Peninsular services he was promoted to colonel and made a K.C.B. Under his command the royal Welsh fusileers joined the Duke of Wellington's army on the field of Waterloo the night before the battle, having made a forced march from Grammont. They were in reserve during the greater part of 18 June, but were brought up into the front line on the left later in the day, and received several French charges in square. Here Ellis received a musket-ball through the right breast. Feeling faint he rode out of the square towards the rear, but in getting over a little ditch fell from his horse and sustained further injuries. He was carried to a neighbouring hovel and his wounds dressed. In the evening of the 19th, after the army had moved on, the hut took fire. Ellis was rescued with great difficulty by Assistant-surgeon Munro of his regiment, but not before he had received severe burns, to which he succumbed on the morning of 20 June 1815. He was buried at Waterloo. The officers and men of the royal Welsh fusileers subsequently placed a monument to his memory in Worcester Cathedral at a cost of 1,200*l.*

Ellis never married (*Notices of the Ellises*, p. 154). He left two sons, to whom the Duke of Wellington gave commissions. Of these the younger, Henry, died young on passage home from India. The elder, Francis Joyner Ellis, died a major in the 62nd foot at Moulmein in 1840. On his death the name of Ellis was assumed by a surviving brother of Major-general John Joyner Ellis, William Joyner, many years coroner of Gloucestershire.

[Ellis's Notices of the Ellises of England and France, 1855–66 (printed privately), pp. 138, 154; Annual Army Lists, in most of which the name is incorrectly given as Henry 'Watson' Ellis; Cannon's Hist. Rec. 23rd Royal Welsh Fusileers; Napier's Hist. Peninsular War; London Gazettes, various.]
H. M. C.

ELLIS, HUMPHREY, D.D. (*d.* 1676), catholic divine, whose true name was Waring, belonged to a family 'of great antiquity and good account,' and finished his theological studies at the English College at Douay. On 25 Aug. 1628 he was sent from Douay, with nine other students, under the care of the Rev. Joseph Harvey, to take possession of the English College which had just been founded at Lisbon. There he pursued his theological studies under Thomas White [q. v.], *alias* Blackloe, and by degrees became professor of philosophy and divinity, doctor in the latter faculty, and president of the

college. Afterwards he returned to England, and was elected dean of the chapter at the general assembly held in November 1657, but he did not take the oath attached to the office until 14 Oct. 1660, although in the meantime he acted in the capacity of dean. By his brethren of the chapter he was highly esteemed, but his position naturally rendered him obnoxious to the jesuits and Franciscans, who were strongly opposed to the introduction of a bishop. The Abate Claudius Agretti, canon of Bruges and minister-apostolic in Belgium, who was sent by the pope on a special mission to examine into the condition of ecclesiastical affairs in England in 1669, stated in his report that Ellis was extremely anxious for the confirmation of the chapter, and was even willing that his holiness should create a new dean and chapter, omitting all the existing members. Agretti doubted, however, whether they would really assent to this sacrifice. He described Ellis as 'noble, esteemed, learned, and moderate, but withal tinged with Blackloeism.' Ellis died in July 1676.

[Dodd's Church Hist. iii. 295; Sergeant's Account of the Chapter erected by William, bishop of Chalcedon, ed. Turnbull, pp. 83, 98; Gillow's Bibl. Dict.; Brady's Episcopal Succession, iii. 110, 126.] T. C.

ELLIS, JAMES (1763?–1830), antiquary, son of William Ellis, a glover, of Hexham, was born about January 1763. He practised as a solicitor in Hexham, and then at Newcastle. He was the author of some verses referred to in Richardson's 'Table Book,' and had an extensive knowledge of Border history. He communicated materials on the latter subject to Sir Walter Scott, who was sometimes his guest at Otterburne Hall in Northumberland, a mansion which Ellis had purchased. Scott calls him 'a learned antiquary.' Ellis died 25 (or 26) March 1830.

[M. A. Richardson's Local Historian's Table Book, iv. 52–4.] W. W.

ELLIS, JOHN (1599?–1665), divine, born at Llandecwyn, Merionethshire, in or about 1599, entered Hart Hall, Oxford, in 1617, where, 'going through with infinite industry the several classes of logic and philosophy,' he proceeded B.A. 27 Feb. 1621, M.A. 29 April 1625 (Wood, *Fasti Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, i. 397, 422). Three years later, having taken orders, he was elected fellow of Jesus College, and became B.D. 9 May 1632 (*ib.* i. 466). On going to Scotland soon afterwards he was admitted D.D. in the university of St. Andrews 'on the day before the calends of August' 1634, and on 21 Oct. following was incorporated at Oxford (*ib.* i. 477). Having before that time married Rebekhah, daughter of John Pettie of Stoke-Talmage, Oxfordshire, he was presented to the rectory of the neighbouring parish of Wheatfield, which he held until 1647, 'or thereabouts,' when he obtained the rectory of Dolgelly, Merionethshire. There he died in 1665, having, says Wood, 'sided with all parties and taken all oaths.' He was buried in the churchyard. His works are: 1. 'Commentarium in Obadiam Prophetam,' 8vo, London, 1641. 2. 'Clavis Fidei, seu brevia quædam in Symbolum Apostolicum dictata scholaribus Aulæ Cervinæ in Academia Oxoniensi publicis prælectionibus proposita,' 12mo, Oxford, 1643. It was translated into English by William Fowler, 'a composer in the art of printing,' 8vo, Cambridge, 1669, and by H. Handley, 8vo, London, 1842. 3. 'Defensio Fidei: seu Responsio succincta ad Argumenta quibus impugnari solet Confessio Anglicana, unà cum nova Articulorum Versione,' 12mo, London, 1660 (a 2nd edit. as 'Articulorum xxxix Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Defensio,' &c., together with the Lambeth Articles, appeared many years after Ellis's death, 12mo, Cambridge, 1694, and was often reprinted. An English version, by J. L. of Sutton Court, was published, 8vo, London, 1700).

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), iii. 709.] G. G.

ELLIS, JOHN (1606?–1681), author of 'Vindiciæ Catholicæ,' was probably descended from a younger son of the family which was long seated at Kiddall Hall, Berwick-in-Elmet, West Riding of Yorkshire. He was fellow and B.D. of St. Catharine Hall, Cambridge, university proctor, and chaplain to Archbishop Abbot. At the commencement of the civil war he took sides with the parliament and was appointed to preach the fast sermon on 22 Feb. 1643. It was published as 'The Sole Path to a Sound Peace, recommended to the Honourable House of Commons in a Sermon [on Mic. v. 5]. . . . By John Ellis, Jun., Preacher of the Word at Cambridge,' 4to, London, 1643. His next work was eagerly read and discussed, 'Vindiciæ Catholicæ, or the Rights of Particular Churches rescued: and asserted against that meer . . . Notion of one Catholick, Visible, Governing Church: the foundation of the . . . Presbyterie: wherein . . . all the Arguments for it, produced by the Rev. Apollonius, M. Hudson, M. Noyes, the London Ministers, and others, are examined and dissolved,' 4to, London, 1647, dedicated 'to the Parliament of England and Assembly of Divines.' Samuel Hudson replied with 'A Vindication' in 1650.

By 1659, when holding the third portion of the rectory of Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire, Ellis had thought fit to change sides. In the preface to a little work entitled 'The Pastor and the Clerk; or a Debate (real) concerning Infant-Baptisme,' published in June of that year, he took occasion to 'retract and recall, repent of and bewayl whatsoever he had either spoken or written for the fomenting the late unnatural divisions in the State and Church . . . particularly what he had said of the one in a "Sermon" . . . as also what he had disputed for the other in a Book entituled "Vindiciæ Catholicæ," in answer to Mr. Hudson's "Essence of Catholick visible Church."' He also announced his 'Retractations and Repentings' on the title-page. As a reward of his apostasy he was allowed to retain his living at the Restoration, and was presented by the king to the first and second portions of Waddesdon, 24 Oct. and 8 Nov. 1661, thus becoming sole rector. He was violently attacked by his former brethren, especially by Henry Hickman in his 'Apologia pro Ministris in Anglia (vulgo) Nonconformists,' 1662. Ellis died at Waddesdon on 3 Nov. 1681, aged 75, and was buried on the 8th in the north side of the chancel of the church, within the altar rails (Lipscomb, *Buckinghamshire*, i. 496, 502, 506, 508). By his wife Susanna, daughter of William Welbore of Cambridge, he had eleven children; John, William, Philip, and Welbore, all separately noticed, and five other children survived him. Mrs. Ellis died at Cambridge on 29 April 1700, aged 77 (a copy of her will is in Addit. MS. 28932, f. 15). A few of Ellis's letters to his children and Dr. Oldys, dated 1673, 1675, and 1680, are preserved in the British Museum (Addit. MS. 28930, ff. 32, 34, 52, 153). Wood, who strenuously defends Ellis's return to conformity, gives him the character of 'a very pious and learned man.'

[Ellis Correspondence, ed. Hon. G. J. W. Agar Ellis, 1829; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ed. Bliss, iii. 710–11, iv. 371–2; Addit. MS. 28937.]

G. G.

ELLIS, JOHN (1643?–1738), undersecretary of state, born in or about 1643, was the eldest son of John Ellis, author of 'Vindiciæ Catholicæ' [q. v.], by his wife Susannah, daughter of William Welbore of Cambridge (pedigree in the *Ellis Correspondence*, 1829, i. xxiii). He received his education at Westminster School, whence he was elected student of Christ Church, Oxford, in 1664 (Welch, *Alumni Westmon.* 1852, p. 159). At college he met Humphrey Prideaux [q. v.], with whom he formed a lifelong friendship. Ellis did not take a degree, but obtained employment in the secretary of state's office. In March 1672 he was under Sir Joseph Williamson in the paper office, Whitehall. On 31 Jan. 1673–4 he was summoned before the House of Lords (*Addit. MS.* 28875, f. 10), but no allusion is made to him in the 'Journal' of that day. On the promotion of Williamson to be secretary of state in the autumn of 1674 Ellis lost his situation, and remained idle for several months, during which he had thoughts of becoming a proctor at Doctors' Commons. He obtained, however, the appointment of secretary to Sir Leoline Jenkins, one of the envoys chosen to attend the conference at Nimeguen, Holland, and set out thither 20 Dec. 1675 (*ib.* 28953, f. 16). He was employed in this capacity until September 1677. His doings during this busy period of his life may be read in his 'Journal of Proceedings of the Nimeguen Conference, 1674–1677' (*ib.* 28953), and 'Note Book at Nimeguen, 1675–6' (*ib.* 28954). From 1678 to 1680 Ellis acted as secretary to Thomas, earl of Ossory. At the beginning of 1680 he again made a journey into Holland to lay before the States-General the claims of Lord Ossory to the rank of general, which the latter had received from the Prince of Orange. He was successful in obtaining the necessary confirmation. After the death of Ossory in August 1680 Ellis became secretary to his father, James, duke of Ormonde, then lord-lieutenant of Ireland. In October 1682 he received the appointment of secretary to the commissioners of the revenue of Ireland, in which post he continued until the revolution. Having left Dublin for England early in 1689, doubtless to satisfy himself with which party it would be safest to side, his place at the Irish treasury was filled up by some one on the spot, and he was forced to spend nearly a year in idleness. Towards the end of 1689 he became secretary to the young Duke of Ormonde, as he had been before to his father, the Earl of Ossory. Two years later he was one of the commissioners of transports, and finally under-secretary of state in May 1695. He filled for ten years the office of undersecretary to four successive secretaries of state (Luttrell, *Relation of State Affairs*, 1857, iii. 468, iv. 316, 705, v. 127, 129, 169); but, owing to some misunderstanding with his then chief, Sir Charles Hedges, he resigned in May 1705 (*ib.* v. 555). If credit can be given to his own account, Ellis was a favourite with William III, who bestowed on him the place of comptroller of the mint, worth 500*l.* a year, 23 May 1701, 'as to an old acquaintance,' he having been with the king 'when he besieged the city of Maestricht, and afterwards in the campaign where he beat the

Marshal of Luxembourg at the battle of Mons or St. Denis (*Egerton MS.* 929, f. 148; Luttrell, v. 48). Ellis's history borders dangerously on fiction. The office was confirmed to him in the next reign by letters patent of 11 June 1702 (*Addit. MS.* 28946, ff. 151, 153). In 1711 he was deprived of it by Harley, and he accordingly petitioned to be reinstated at the accession of George I (*Egerton MS.* 929, f. 148).

Ellis sat for Harwich, Essex, in the parliament of 1705–8 (*Lists of Members of Parliament, Official Return*, pt. ii. p. 3), and in 1710 unsuccessfully contested Rye, Sussex (Smith, *Parliaments of England*, ii. 90; Luttrell, vi. 686, 688). He died unmarried at his house in Pall Mall 8 July 1738, having attained the patriarchal age of ninety-five (*Gent. Mag.* viii. 380; *Hist. Reg.* xxiii., Chron. Diary, p. 27). By making good use of his opportunities while in office he had contrived to amass enormous wealth. His will of 2 March 1733 was proved at London 15 July 1738 (registered in P. C. C., 173, Brodrepp). He gave 50*l.* towards the buildings in Peckwater quadrangle at Christ Church, Oxford. To his brother, Sir William Ellis [q. v.], he had lent on his own showing 1,231*l.* principal money, in consideration of which debt he received a grant of the former's forfeited estate in Ireland from William III. The estate, 'which was encumber'd to near its value,' having been 'resumed' and vested in trustees by the Act of Resumption (11 and 12 Will. III) 'before he had received any benefit by it,' Ellis in the next reign petitioned parliament for a bill of relief, and obtained it in May 1702 (*The Case of Mr. John Ellis*, s. sh. folio, London, 1702; *John Ellis appellant, John Whinery respondent. The Respondent's Case*, folio, London, 1720; *Commons' Journals*, xiii. 556, 841–2, 855, 890, 893, 897). He died possessed of the estate.

Ellis left a large collection of letters addressed to him on both public and private matters, from which we may judge him to have been a man of excellent business habits, industrious, good-tempered, and obliging. Two volumes of his correspondence during 1686, 1687, and 1688 were edited in 1829 from the Additional (Birch) MS. 4194, by the Hon. G. J. W. Agar-Ellis [q. v.], afterwards Lord Dover, the descendant of his brother Welbore Ellis. Attention had already been drawn to the value of the manuscript by Sir Henry Ellis, who published some extracts in vol. iv., 2nd ser., of his 'Original Letters.' In 1872 the trustees of the British Museum purchased from the Earl of Macclesfield a voluminous collection of Ellis's official and private correspondence and papers extending from 1643 to 1720, now numbered Addit. MSS. 28875–956. Deeds relating to his family, 1669–98, are Addit. Charters 19517–39. The letters from Humphrey Prideaux (Addit. MS. 28929), ranging from 1674 to 1722, but unfortunately with many gaps, were edited for the Camden Society in 1875 by Mr. Edward Maunde Thompson. Ellis's letters to George Stepney, 1700–8, are in Addit. MSS. 7074, f. 1, 7078, ff. 5, 35, 41, 92; a letter to Adam de Cardonnel of 6 Oct. 1702 is Addit. MS. 7074, f. 154, and at f. 159 of the same collection is preserved a letter to Charles Whitworth, the resident at Ratisbon, dated 17 Nov. 1702. Others of his letters are mentioned in the 'Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.'

Ellis was one of the many lovers of the Duchess of Cleveland. His intrigue is mysteriously alluded to in six lines of Pope's 'Sober Advice from Horace,' from which it would seem that, having offended the duchess by boasting of the intimacy, he was, at her instigation, reduced to the condition of Atys (Pope, *Works*, ed. Warton, 1797, vi. 45). In a poem called 'The Town Life' he is singled out from certain disreputable company as 'that epitome of lewdness, Ellys' (*Poems on Affairs of State*, ed. 1703–7, i. 192). There is also allusion to him in 'The Session of the Poets' (*ib.* i. 210).

[Ellis's Introduction to the Ellis Correspondence, 1829; Thompson's Preface (pp. vi–viii) and Notes to Letters of H. Prideaux to J. Ellis (Camd. Soc. new ser. 15); authorities cited in the text.] G. G.

ELLIS, JOHN (1701–1757), portrait painter. [See Ellys.]

ELLIS, JOHN (1710?–1776), naturalist, whom Linnæus termed a 'bright star of natural history' and 'the main support of natural history in England,' was born in Ireland about 1710. This is admitted by Sir J. E. Smith (*Linnæan Correspondence*, i. 79), in correction of his previous statement in Rees's 'Encyclopædia' that Ellis was a native of London. Ellis was in business as a merchant in London, with, it is stated, but little success, until in 1764 he obtained the appointment of agent for West Florida, to which was added in 1770 the agency for Dominica. This brought him many correspondents, and he used his opportunities to import various American seeds. In 1754 he became a fellow of the Royal Society, and in the following year established his reputation as one of the most acute observers of his time by the publication of 'An Essay towards the Natural History of the Corallines,' London,

4to. This work was translated into French in the following year; and though his views were opposed by Dr. Job Baster and but imperfectly comprehended by Linnæus, he established by it the animal nature of this group of organisms. In 1768 the Copley medal of the Royal Society was awarded to Ellis for these researches. In 1770 he published 'Directions for bringing over Seeds and Plants from the East Indies. . . . To which is added the figure and description of a new sensitive plant called *Dionæa muscipula*,' in which he accurately describes the mechanism of what we now know to be an insectivorous plant. In the fifty-first volume of the 'Philosophical Transactions' he described the new genera *Halesia* and *Gardenia*, and in the sixtieth volume the genus *Gordonia*, on which a letter to Linnæus was published, with one to Aiton on a new species of *Illicium* in 1771. These were followed in 1774 and 1775 by descriptions of the coffee-tree, the mangostan, and the breadfruit, all alike marked by that thoroughness from which it has happened that none of his genera have been superseded. This fate, however, having befallen one dedicated to him by Dr. Patrick Browne, Linnæus named a group of boraginaceous plants *Ellisia* in his honour. Various papers by him in the 'Philosophical Transactions' are supplementary to his 'Natural History of Corallines,' his first collection of which animals was placed in the British Museum; but much matter which he had collected was published by his friend Solander after his death as 'The Natural History of many uncommon Zoophytes collected by John Ellis, arranged and described by D.C. Solander,' London, 1786. Ellis died in London, 15 Oct. 1776, leaving a daughter, Martha, afterwards Mrs. Alexander Watt, by whom her father's correspondence was entrusted to Sir J. E. Smith.

[Rees; Linnæan Correspondence, i. 79; Nichols's Lit. Anecd. ix. 531; Loudon's Arboretum Britannicum, p. 70.] G. S. B.

ELLIS, JOHN (1698–1790), scrivener and political writer, son of James and Susannah Ellis, was born in the parish of St. Clement Danes, London, 22 March 1698. His father was of an eccentric and roving disposition, a good swordsman, and very agile, but unable, from his narrow means, to provide his children with a proper education. John was first sent to a wretched day-school in Dogwell Court, Whitefriars, with a brother and two sisters, and was afterwards removed to another, not much superior, in Wine Office Court, Fleet Street. Here he learned the rudiments of grammar, chiefly by his own industry, and is said while at school to have translated a Latin poem of Payne Fisher entitled 'Marston Moore, sive de obsidione prœlioque Eboracensi carmen lib. 6,' 1650, 4to, which was afterwards published in 1750 (Watt, *Bibl. Brit.*) His mother, Susannah Philpot, was a fanatical dissenter, and the strictness of her discipline in his early years caused him to entertain throughout his life a strong aversion to sectaries. He began his business career as clerk or apprentice to Mr. John Taverner, a scrivener in Threadneedle Street, and improved his knowledge of Latin by listening to the assistance which his master gave in his school-exercises to his son, who was a pupil at Merchant Taylors' School. On the death of his master Ellis succeeded to the business in partnership with young Taverner, whose idleness and imprudence involved him for a long period in considerable anxiety and loss. The proper business of a scrivener was to make charters and deeds concerning lands and tenements and all other writings which by law are required to be sealed, and Ellis, who outlived every member of the profession, was equally respected by his clients, personal acquaintances, and literary friends. Among the earliest of these were Dr. King of Oxford and his pupil Lord Orrery, with whom he frequently exchanged visits. He also corresponded on intimate terms with the Rev. N. Fayting, master of Merchant Taylors' School, rector of St. Martin Outwich, and prebendary of Lincoln, their letters being frequently in verse. In 1742–3 he made a poetical translation of Dr. King's 'Templum Libertatis,' which, however, like most of his literary efforts, was not printed. Another intimate friend was Moses Mendez, who addressed to him a poetical epistle describing a journey to Ireland, which, with Ellis's reply, also in verse, was printed in a 'Collection of Poems,' published in 1767.

Chief among the circle of his literary friends and admirers was Dr. Johnson, who once said to Boswell, 'It is wonderful, sir, what is to be found in London. The most literary conversation that I ever enjoyed was at the table of Jack Ellis, a money-scrivener behind the Royal Exchange, with whom I used to dine generally once a week.' Ellis, though not ambitious of publication, did not discontinue writing verses for more than seventy years, and used frequently to recite with energy and vivacity poems of a hundred lines after the age of eighty-eight years. His principal work was a translation of 'Ovid's Epistles,' which Johnson frequently recommended him to publish, but his modesty would not allow it. The few pieces he published were: 1. 'The South Sea Dream,' a poem in Hudibrastic verse,

1720. 2. A verse translation from Latin of a rather broad jeu d'esprit entitled 'The Surprise, or the Gentleman turned Apothecary,' 1739, 12mo, originally written in French prose. 3. A travesty of Maphæus, published in 1758 with the following title:

'The Canto added by Maphæus
To Virgil's twelve books of Æneas,
From the original Bombastic,
Done into English Hudibrastic,
With notes beneath, and Latin text,
In every other page annext.'

He also contributed several small pieces to Dodsley's 'Collection of Poems by several hands,' 6 vols., 1763, which were printed with his name in the sixth volume of the work. One of these, 'The Cheat's Apology,' was set to music and sung by Vernon at Vauxhall with much success. A short allegorical poem, 'Tartana, or the Plaidie,' was printed in 1782 in the 'European Magazine' (ii. 151, 234). A number of his verses, composed at various times for Boydell, Bowles, and other printsellers, were also printed. Besides many unpublished poems he left behind him versions of Æsop and Cato, and of portions of Ovid's 'Metamorphoses.' According to an unpublished poem addressed to Ellis by Moses Mendez, printed by 'W. C.' in 'Notes and Queries' (4th ser. vii. 5), he used to attend at the Cock tavern in Threadneedle Street every Friday evening at eight o'clock to enjoy the society of his literary friends; his cheerful and amiable disposition and large fund of anecdotes, which he told with great effect, making him a very agreeable companion.

Ellis took an active part in the affairs of the Scriveners' Company, of which he was four times master. His portrait was painted in 1781 by T. Frye, at the expense of the company, to be hung in their hall, and was also engraved for them by W. Pether, he being in his eighty-third year. Ellis was also for forty years an active member of the corporation of London, being elected a common councilman for Broad Street ward in 1750, and afterwards appointed alderman's deputy. The duties of the latter post he actively discharged until his resignation on St. Thomas's day 1790, not many days before his death. In January 1765 he was an unsuccessful candidate for the office of chamberlain of London. Ellis was never married, and, being of temperate and cheerful habits, lived to an advanced age. Up to his eighty-fifth year he used frequently to walk thirty miles a day. Boswell, who visited him 4 Oct. 1790, in his ninety-third year, found his judgment distinct and clear and his memory 'able to serve him very well after a little recollection' (*Life of Johnson*, ed. Hill, iii. 21). In the last year of his life his circumstances were reduced by the bankruptcy of a person whom he had generously assisted, but his friends speedily relieved him. He died 31 Dec. 1790, and was buried 5 Jan. 1791 in the church of St. Bartholomew by the Exchange. He lived for many years in Black Swan Court, and afterwards in Capel Court, Bartholomew Lane. A letter from him to Dr. Johnson, printed in the 'European Magazine,' describes a remarkable alteration in his eyesight, which occurred in his eighty-sixth year, while on a short visit to Margate.

[An excellent account of Ellis is contributed by his friend, Isaac Reed, to the European Magazine for 1792, xxi. 3–5, 125–8, with portrait; Scriveners' Company's Records; Nichols's Lit. Anecd. 18th Cent., iii. 409.] C. W–H.

ELLIS, JOHN (1789–1862), member of parliament and railway chairman, was born in 1789 at Sharman's Lodge, near Leicester, where his father, Joseph Ellis, was a farmer. From 1807 to 1847 he was a very successful farmer at Beaumont Leys, also near Leicester. During the latter part of that time he had also a business in Leicester. In 1830 he made the acquaintance of George Stephenson, and afterwards took a prominent part in promoting the Leicester and Swannington railway. In 1836 he gave important evidence before a select committee of the House of Commons on agricultural distress. He was member of parliament for the borough of Leicester from 1848 until 1852, when he retired. From 1849 to 1858 he was chairman of the Midland railway. Throughout life he was a liberal in politics. He came of an old quaker family, still well known around Leicester, of which borough he was an alderman. He was also a justice of the peace for the county, and was prominently connected with many public matters, both of a local and general nature. He died at Belgrave, near Leicester, on 26 Oct. 1862.

[Private information; also Charlotte Ellis's Sketch of one Branch of the Ellis Family (Leicester, privately printed).] M. C–Y.

ELLIS, PHILIP, in religion MICHAEL (1652–1726), catholic prelate, born in 1652, was the third son of the Rev. John Ellis, author of 'Vindiciæ Catholicæ' [q. v.], by Susannah, daughter of William Welbore, esq., of Cambridge. His eldest brother, John Ellis [q. v.], became under-secretary of state to William III; the second son, Sir William Ellis (*d.* 1734), was secretary of state to James II; and Welbore Ellis [q.v.], the fourth son and next brother to Philip, was appointed protestant bishop of Killala and afterwards

of Meath. Philip was admitted into Westminster School on the foundation in 1667 (Welch, *Alumni Westmon.* ed. Phillimore, p. 163). The editor of the 'Ellis Correspondence' (i. 18) incorrectly asserts that while there 'Philip was kidnapped by the jesuits, and brought up by them in the Roman catholic religion in their college of St. Omer.' The truth is that, after his conversion to catholicism, he proceeded to the Benedictine convent of St. Gregory at Douay, where he was professed 30 Nov. 1670 (Weldon, *Chronicle*, append. p. 11). For many years he was not heard of by his family, and perhaps he might never have been discovered but for the circumstance of his being called 'Jolly Phil' at Douay, as he had been at Westminster (*Gent. Mag.* xxxix. 328). Having finished his studies he was ordained priest and sent to labour upon the mission in England. His abilities recommended him to the notice of James II, who appointed him one of his chaplains and preachers.

In 1687 Innocent XI divided England into four ecclesiastical districts, and allowed James to nominate persons to govern them. Ellis was accordingly appointed, by letters apostolic dated 30 Jan. 1687–8, the first vicar-apostolic of the western district, and was consecrated on 6 May 1688 by Ferdinand d'Adda, archbishop of Amasia, *in partibus*, at St. James's, where the king had founded a convent of fourteen Benedictine monks. He received the see of Aureliopolis, *in partibus*, for his title. Like the other vicars-apostolic he had a salary of 1,000*l.* a year out of the royal exchequer, and 500*l.* when he entered on his office. In the second week of July 1688 he confirmed a number of youths, some of whom were converts, in the new chapel of the Savoy. His name is subscribed to the 'Pastoral Letter of the four Catholic Bishops to the Lay-Catholics of England,' issued in 1688. It is doubted whether he ever visited his diocese, for on the breaking out of the revolution in November 1688 he was arrested and imprisoned in Newgate (Macaulay, *Hist. of England*, ed. 1858, ii. 565). He soon regained his liberty, however, and repaired to the court of St. Germain. Shortly afterwards he proceeded to Rome, where he formed a close friendship with Cardinal Howard.

After Sir John Lytcott's return from Rome James II had no one to represent him at the papal court, and Cardinal Howard and Bishop Ellis in 1693, without being invested with a public character, promoted his interests and corresponded with his ministers (Macpherson, *Original Papers*, i. 469, 531). Ellis was never able to return to England to take charge of his vicariate. Writing on 18 Jan. 1702 to Bishop Gifford, who in his absence administered the ecclesiastical affairs of the western district, he said that some years previously persons well acquainted with the aspect of the English court were of opinion that a license to return would not be denied to him, but James II would not allow him to ask for one. Subsequently, when his 'old master' was not so averse to his return, 'the face of things was much changed, and the permission, though not denied, yet not granted, but rather deferred' (Brady, *Episcopal Succession*, iii. 286). In or before 1705 Ellis resigned his vicariate into the hands of Clement XI, who on 3 Oct. 1708 appointed him to the bishopric of Segni in the State of the Church. There he founded a diocesan seminary and substantially repaired and embellished the episcopal palace. The acts of a synod of his clergy held in the cathedral of Segni in November 1710 were highly approved by Clement XI, who ordered them to be printed and published. Ellis died on 16 Nov. 1726, and was buried in the church attached to the seminary, to which he bequeathed the bulk of his property. Pope Leo XII gave Ellis's library and ring to Bishop Baines for the use of his successors in the western district.

Several sermons preached by him before the king and queen (1685–7) were separately published at London, and some of them are included in 'A Collection of Catholick Sermons,' 2 vols. London, 1741. In the sermon preached before the king 13 Nov. 1686 he announced that the English Benedictine congregation had authorised him to declare absolute renunciation on their part to all titles or rights which might possibly be inherent in them to possessions formerly in their hands (Weldon, *Chronicle*, p. 229). Ellis's correspondence with Cardinal Gualterio (1712–20) is in the British Museum (Addit. MS. 20310), and several of his letters, dated Rome, 1695, are in possession of the Bishop of Southwark (*Hist. MSS. Commission*, 3rd Rep. Append. p. 233).

His portrait, engraved by Henry Meyer, from the original picture in the possession of Viscount Clifden, is prefixed to the first vol. of the 'Ellis Correspondence,' edited by the Hon. George Agar Ellis, 2 vols. London, 1829.

[Dodd's Church Hist. iii. 467; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), iii. 709–10; Welch's Alumni Westmon. (Phillimore), 164; Snow's Obituary, 95; Weldon's Chronicle, 139, 231, 238; Panzani's Memoirs, 365, 373; Addit. MS. 28931, ff. 3, 15; Luttrell's Hist. Relation of State Affairs, i. 439, 443, 451, 486; Flanagan's Hist.

of the Church in England, ii. 354, 357; Rambler (1851), vii. 313; Gillow's Bibl. Dict. and corrections thereof; Ellis Correspondence; Oliver's Catholic Religion in Cornwall, 294, 511; Notes and Queries, 1st ser. vi. 125, 298, 400, vii. 242, 2nd ser. iii. 406, 432, 518, 5th ser. ix. 268, 454; Granger's Biog. Hist. of Engl. 5th ed. vi. 109 *n.*; Palmer's Life of Cardinal Howard, 203, 206, 210; Catholic Directory (1888), p. 58.] T. C.

ELLIS, Sir RICHARD (1688?-1742), theological writer. [See Ellys.]

ELLIS, ROBERT (Cynddelw) (1810–1875), baptist minister and Welsh poet, was born on 3 Feb. 1810, in Ty'n-y-meini, in the parish of Llanrhaiadr yn Mochnant, Denbighshire. He went to school for two months to Llanwyddelen and for one month to Llanarmon. His only other education was at the Sunday school. When he had grown up to manhood, and had begun preaching, he went for some months to one John Williams of Llansilin, whose biography he afterwards wrote. Here he read, among other things, Watts 'On the Mind' and 'On Logic.' The teacher's remarks and questions on these works stimulated Ellis's mind. His thirst for knowledge was henceforth insatiable. He read everything that came in his way, and his library became ultimately perhaps one of the largest and most valuable private libraries in the Principality. He had no fear of reputed heretics. In the words of his biographer, 'the names of Stuart Mill, Huxley, Matthew Arnold, &c., were no terror to him; but he ventured out with them, listened to them, weighed them, and formed his own opinion of them.' On 5 Oct. 1834 he began preaching, and in May 1837 he settled as minister of Llanelian and Llanddulas; in 1838 we find him in Glynceiriog, Denbighshire; in Sirhowy, Monmouthshire, 1847; and in Carnarvon, 1862–75. Ellis died on 20 Aug. 1875, while on a preaching tour, at his brother-in-law's house at Gartheryr. As a preacher he is said to have been learned rather than popular, though as a public lecturer he was both popular and learned. Iolo Morganwg, Carnhuanawc, and Thomas Stephens may have gone deeper into antiquarian subjects, but Ellis showed more skill in popularising them. The subjects of some of these lectures were ancient Welsh wisdom, Welsh proverbs, Welsh laws, &c.

His published works are: 1. 'Lectures on Baptism,' 1841. 2. 'An Ode (Awdl) on the Resurrection,' 1849; 2nd edition, 1852. 3. 'Tafol y Beirdd, an Essay on Welsh Prosody,' 1852. 4. 'The Principles of Biblical Exegesis,' 1854. 5. 'Exposition of the Bible,' which began to appear in parts in June 1855, and was still going on when he died. 6. 'An Elegy (Awdl Farwnad) on Gwrwst,' 1856. 7. 'Memoir of Dr. Ellis Evans,' 1864. 8. 'Geiriadur Cymraeg Cymreig,' 1868. 9. 'Memoir of John Williams,' 1871. 10. Portions of 'Hanes y Brytaniaid a'r Cymry' (Mackenzie), 1870–1. 11. 'Catecism y Bedyddwyr, Holwyddoreg ar Fywyd Crist, Manion Hynafiaethol, Awdl ar Ddystawrwydd,' 1873. Second edition of Rees Jones's 'Gorchestion Beirdd Cymru,' first published in 1773, with extensive and valuable notes (date of preface, 1861); 2nd edition of Dr. W. O. Pughe's 'Dafydd ab Gwilym,' with a valuable introduction; his last published work was on the Atonement. Besides these he wrote largely for the periodical literature of the day, some of his best articles being found in the 'Traethodydd,' 'Geiriadur Beiblaidd a Duwinyddol Mathetes,' 'Gwyddoniadur,' 'Geirlyfr Bywgraffiadol Foulkes,' &c.

His poetical works, published in 1877, were edited by Ioan Arfon, and bound with them was his biography prepared for the Wrexham Eisteddfod by the Rev. J. Spinther James.

[James's Biography, as above.] R. J. J.

ELLIS, ROBERT (1820?–1885), classical scholar, was admitted a member of St. John's College, Cambridge, 9 April 1836, elected a scholar 5 Nov. 1839, and graduated B.A. as fifth wrangler in 1840, obtaining a fellowship 30 March 1841 (*College Register of Admissions*). He took his M.A. degree in 1843, and was ordained two years later. In 1850 he commenced B.D. He vacated his fellowship by his marriage, 2 April 1872, at Meolbrace, near Shrewsbury, to Jane, daughter of Francis France of Nobold, Shropshire (*Eddowes's Shrewsbury Journal*, 10 April 1872). He died, 20 Dec. 1885, at 3 Higher Summerlands, Exeter, aged 65 (*Times*, 23 Dec. 1885). He is chiefly known by his sharp controversy with William John Law [q. v.], which ranged from 1854 to 1856, on the route followed by Hannibal in his passage of the Alps. Ellis had investigated the subject during excursions in the Alps in July 1852 and in April and May 1853. His works are as follows: 1. 'A Treatise on Hannibal's Passage of the Alps, in which his route is traced over the Little Mount Cenis,' 8vo, Cambridge [printed], London, 1853. On this subject he wrote besides two elaborate dissertations in December 1855 and in March 1856 in 'The Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology' (ii. 308–29, iii. 1–34), which are entitled 'Observations on Mr. Law's "Criticism of Mr. Ellis's new Theory concerning

the Route of Hannibal."' 2. 'Contributions to the Ethnography of Italy and Greece,' 8vo, London, 1858. 3. 'The Armenian Origin of the Etruscans,' 8vo, London, 1861. 4. 'An Enquiry into the Ancient Routes between Italy and Gaul; with an examination of the Theory of Hannibal's Passage of the Alps by the Little St. Bernard,' 8vo, Cambridge, 1867. 5. 'The Asiatic Affinities of the Old Italians,' 8vo, London, 1870. 6. 'On Numerals as Signs of Primeval Unity among Mankind,' 8vo, London, 1873. 7. 'Peruvia Scythica. The Quichua Language of Peru; its derivation from Central Asia with the American Languages in general, and with the Turanian and Iberian Languages of the Old World,' &c., 8vo, London, 1875. 8. 'Etruscan Numerals,' 8vo, London, 1876. 9. 'Sources of the Etruscan and Basque Languages' [with a preface by Mrs. Jane Ellis], 8vo, London, 1886.

[A notice of Ellis appeared shortly after his death in the Eagle, a magazine supported by members of St. John's College.] G. G.

ELLIS, ROBERT LESLIE (1817–1859), man of science and letters, son of Francis Ellis of Bath, was born at Bath on 25 Aug. 1817. He was educated first by private tutors at home, and then by the Rev. James Challis, rector of Papworth Everard, Cambridgeshire, and afterwards Plumian professor at Cambridge. Of his early promise a remarkable account is given by Sir W. Napier, who describes him at fourteen as 'such a proud, bright, clever, beautiful boy,' and speaks of his astonishment at the boy's information, thought, and originality. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1836, graduated as senior wrangler in 1840, was elected fellow in October of the same year, and proceeded M.A. in 1843. He resided in college during the years he held his fellowship, giving his attention chiefly, though by no means entirely, to mathematical subjects. On the occasion of the British Association holding its annual meeting in Cambridge in 1845, he undertook a report on the recent progress of analysis, which appeared in the volume of the association published in 1846. Soon after this, in conjunction with Mr. D. D. Heath and Mr. J. Spedding, he undertook to edit the works of Bacon, his especial share being to edit and annotate the philosophical section of his works. His wide reading and great powers are fully evidenced from what he has done in the edition, but ill-health prevented the carrying out of what he had proposed for himself. His health had never been good, and in 1847 threatened to give way altogether. He tried Malvern and then Nice. After leaving Nice, he was attacked at San Remo by rheumatic fever, caught probably at Mentone, and returned to England with difficulty a confirmed invalid. His last years from 1853 to 1859 were spent at Anstey Hall, Trumpington, where he had the comfort of the society of his Cambridge friends, and especially that of Professor Grote, the vicar. The disease gained on him gradually, compelling him to keep his bed, and at last depriving him of sight. He continued, however, to dictate memoirs on mathematical and other subjects, till nearly the end. His death occurred on 12 May 1859, and he was buried in Trumpington churchyard.

During his residence in Trinity College he edited the 'Cambridge Mathematical Journal' for a part of its career, and on the death of his friend, D. F. Gregory, contributed a memoir of him to its pages. His scattered memoirs were collected and edited by his friend, Mr. W. Walton, in 1863. How wide his range of knowledge was may be seen by the titles of a few only of the papers in this volume. Among them are papers on 'Roman Aqueducts,' on the 'Form of Bees' Cells,' on the 'Formation of a Chinese Dictionary,' on 'Vegetable Spirals,' on 'Comparative Metrology,' on Boole's 'Laws of Thought,' on Diez's 'Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen,' on the 'Value of Roman Money,' &c. His memory was very extraordinary, and those who remember his conversational powers before (and even after) his illness can testify to their charm and to the exquisite taste which characterised all he said.

[Memoir by H. Goodwin (now bishop of Carlisle) prefixed to Walton's edition of Ellis's Remains; Notes, privately printed, by J. P. Norris (now archdeacon of Bristol); Bruce's Life of Sir W. Napier (1864), ii. 460–2; personal knowledge.] H. R. L.

ELLIS, Sir SAMUEL BURDON (1787–1865), general, son of Captain Charles Ellis, R.N., entered the royal marine light infantry as a second lieutenant on 1 Jan. 1804. He was at once sent on board ship, and, after first seeing service in Sir Robert Calder's action off Cape Finisterre, was present at the battle of Trafalgar, and was promoted lieutenant in 1806. He was present in the Walcheren expedition in 1809 and in the capture of Guadeloupe in 1810, and being on board the Nymphe was employed off the coast, first of Spain and then of southern France during the latter years of the Peninsular war. He specially distinguished himself in the operations which the navy took in helping to form the siege of Bayonne, after

Wellington's victory of the Nive and Soult's retreat on Toulouse. His ship was then ordered to the North American coast, where she captured the American frigate the President after a fierce fight, during which Ellis particularly distinguished himself, being the first man to board the enemy. On the conclusion of peace Ellis had no further opportunity to see service, and it was not until 15 Nov. 1826, when he had been more than twenty years in the marines, that he was promoted captain. It was not until many more years had passed, during which Ellis was employed in many different ships, that he again saw service in the capture of Fort Manora, which commands the entrance to the harbour of Kurrachee in Scinde, in 1839. He next commanded the marines employed in the Persian Gulf, and was mentioned in despatches for his services in bringing off the political resident at Bushire during a riot there, and saving his life. When the Chinese war broke out in 1840 he had the good fortune to be employed on the China station, and for his services in command of a battalion of marines at the capture of Chusan on 5 July 1840, and at the battle of Chuenpee on 7 Jan. 1841, he was promoted major by brevet on 6 May 1841. Before the news of his promotion reached him he had still further distinguished himself with his marines in the bombardment of the Bogue forts; he commanded the advance on Canton, and the services of his men were so great at the storming of the Canton forts on 26 May 1841, that he was promoted lieutenant-colonel by brevet, antedated to that day, and made a C.B. He then commanded a battalion of marines at Ningpo and Chusan until the conclusion of the war, when he returned to England. He was promoted colonel on 3 Nov. 1851, and commanded the Chatham division of the royal marines until he became major-general on 20 June 1855. He was promoted lieutenant-general in 1857, made a K.C.B. in 1860, promoted general in 1862, and died at Old Charlton on 10 March 1865, after having been for more than sixty years an officer of marines, at the age of seventy-eight.

[Hart's Army List; Gent. Mag. April 1865.]

H. M. S.

ELLIS, SARAH STICKNEY. [See under Ellis, William, 1795–1872.]

ELLIS, THOMAS (1625–1673), Welsh antiquary, the son of Griffith Ellis of Dolbemaen, Carnarvonshire, was born at that place in 1625. At the age of fifteen he was entered at Jesus College, Oxford, and took the B.A. degree in 1644. In the same year he is stated by Wood to have borne arms for the king in the garrison at Oxford. A letter containing 'The exact and full Relation of the last Fight between the King's forces and Sir William Waller,' which describes the battle at Cropredy Bridge and is signed Thomas Ellis, was published in July of this year; but the writer belonged to the parliamentary army. Ellis proceeded to the M.A. degree on 23 Jan. 1646, and was elected a fellow of his college, where he continued to reside as a tutor. On the resignation of Dr. F. Mansell he confidently expected to succeed him as principal of Jesus, but, being disappointed in this hope, he threw up his tutorial work, and, though still remaining at Oxford, lived in retirement. In 1665 Ellis, who had taken the B.D. degree on 17 Oct. 1661, became rector of St. Mary's, Dolgelly, Merionethshire, succeeding his kinsman, Dr. John Ellis. While still at Oxford he had devoted himself largely to the study of Welsh antiquity, and had made himself a recognised authority on the subject. At the request of Robert Vaughan, who purposed publishing a revised and enlarged edition of Powell's 'History of Cambria,' but who was unable to find time for the work, Ellis undertook to carry it on, incorporating his own notes with Vaughan's additions and corrections. One hundred and twenty-eight sheets of the book had been printed by Hall of Oxford, when Ellis refused to proceed, alleging that all the materials with which he had been supplied by Vaughan had been already utilised by Percie Enderbie in his 'Cambria Triumphans.' As the latter work was published in 1661 and the sheets of Ellis's book are dated 1663, it is curious that he did not make the discovery earlier. Persisting in the belief that he had been anticipated in his researches, Ellis published nothing further. In 1775, however, there was issued, together with a 'History of the Island of Anglesey' by H. Rowlands, 'Memoirs of Owen Glendowr, being a well-compiled History of the Transactions during the whole war, originally written by Mr. Thomas Ellis, and now faithfully copied out of a manuscript in the Library of Jesus College.' Ellis died in the spring of 1673 at his birthplace, Dolbemaen, and was there buried.

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ed. Bliss, iii. 992; Fasti, ii. 70, 91, 250; Williams's Eminent Welshmen.]

A. V.

ELLIS, THOMAS FLOWER (1796–1861), law reporter, born in 1796, was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1818, and was elected a fellow. He was a brilliant scholar, though only a senior optime in the mathematical tripos. He became a member of Lincoln's

Inn, and was called to the bar in February 1824, and for some years went the northern circuit. Here he first became acquainted with Macaulay, whose intimate friend he ever afterwards remained. So attached were they, that when Macaulay went to India, Ellis wrote to him that, 'next to his wife, he was the person for whom he felt the most thorough attachment, and in whom he placed the most unlimited confidence.' In later life they visited the continent together every autumn, and he was an executor of Macaulay's will. After his friend died the light seemed to have gone out of Ellis's life, but he occupied himself in preparing for publication the posthumous collection of Macaulay's essays. In 1831 he was a commissioner under the Reform Bill to determine the boundaries of parliamentary boroughs in Wales. In early life he enjoyed a considerable practice. He was till his death attorney-general for the Duchy of Lancaster, and had 'Palatine silk;' and in 1839 he succeeded Armstrong as recorder of Leeds. He was, about 1830, a contributor to the 'Edinburgh Review,' was a member of the Useful Knowledge Society, and revised several of its publications. He is best known as part author of three excellent series of law reports: 'Adolphus and Ellis,' 1835–42; 'Ellis and Blackburn,' 1853–8; and 'Ellis and Ellis,' published after his death. He died at his house, 15 Bedford Place, Russell Square, 5 April 1861. His wife died in March 1839; and he had two children, Francis and Marian.

[Trevelyan's Life of Macaulay; Knight's Passages of a Working Life, ii. 126; Gent. Mag. 1861; Law Times, 27 April 1861.] J. A. H.

ELLIS, WELBORE (1651?–1734), bishop of Meath and a privy councillor in Ireland, descended from an ancient family at Kiddall Hall, Yorkshire, was the fourth son of the Rev. John Ellis (1606?–1681), rector of Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire, and author of 'Vindiciæ Catholicæ.' His brothers John and William are separately noticed. He was educated at Westminster School and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1684, M.A. 1687, and B.D. and D.D. by diploma 1697. He likewise received in 1732 the *ad eundem* degree of D.D. from Trinity College, Dublin. His three brothers, Sir William (1642?–1730), John (1645–1738), and Philip (1653–1726), are separately noticed. Welbore Ellis became a prebendary of Winchester in 1696. He was promoted in 1705, by patent dated 22 Sept., to the bishopric of Kildare, with the deanery of Christ Church, Dublin, *in commendam*, and was translated, 13 March 1731, to the premier bishopric of Meath, with a seat in the Irish privy council. He married Diana, daughter of Sir William Briscoe, knt., of Boughton, Northamptonshire, and Amberley Castle, Sussex, and had, with other issue, Welbore, afterwards Lord Mendip [q. v.] He died on 1 Jan. 1733–4, and was buried with great ceremony in the cathedral of Christ Church, Dublin, where a monument was 'erected by his only surviving son, the Right Hon. Welbore Ellis.' The funeral procession included the boys of the Bluecoat Hospital, to which he had bequeathed 100*l.* (*Cooper MS.*, quoted by Bishop Mant). A portrait of Ellis is preserved in the hall of Christ Church, Oxford. His publications are: 1. 'The Dean of Dublin, Plaintiff, Archbishop of Dublin, Defendant, upon a Writ of Error—the Defendant's Case,' London, 1724. 2. 'The Lord Bishop of Kildare, Dean of the Church of the Holy Trinity of Dublin, Plaintiff in Error. The Lord Archbishop of Dublin Defendant in Error. The Plaintiff in Error's Case,' London, 1724.

[The Ellis Correspondence; Alumni Westmonast. 189–90; Wood's Athenæ (Bliss), iii. 711; Catalogue of Oxford Graduates; Sir James Ware's Works, ed. Harris, i. 164, 396; Cotton's Fasti Ecclesiæ Hibernicæ, ii. 45, 234, iii. 122, v. 90, 143; Bishop Mant's History of the Church of Ireland, ii. 175, 528.] B. H. B.

ELLIS, WELBORE, first Baron Mendip (1713–1802), younger son of the Right Rev. Dr. Welbore Ellis, bishop of Meath [q. v.], by his wife, Diana, daughter of Sir John Briscoe of Boughton, Northamptonshire, was born at Kildare on 15 Dec. 1713, and was educated at Westminster School, where he was admitted on the foundation as head of his election in 1728, and was elected to a studentship at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1732. He graduated B.A. 5 June 1736, and at the general election in May 1741 contested the borough of Cricklade. A double return was made for this constituency, but ultimately the seat was assigned to Ellis by an order of the House of Commons on 24 Dec. 1741. In November 1744 and again in October 1745 Ellis seconded the address to the throne (*Parl. Hist.* xiii. 991–2, 1331–3). In February 1747 he was appointed a lord of the admiralty, in Henry Pelham's administration, in the place of George Grenville, who was promoted to the treasury board, and was returned as one of the members for the joint boroughs of Weymouth and Melcombe Regis at the general election in July of the same year. He continued in office after Pelham's death in March 1754, and was re-elected for Weymouth in the following month, but resigning his seat at the admiralty in December 1755 was appointed one of the vice-treasurers of Ireland. On 20 March 1760

Ellis was sworn a member of the privy council. At the general election in March 1761 he was returned with Wilkes for the borough of Aylesbury, and resigning the post of vice-treasurer was appointed secretary at war on 17 Dec. 1762 in the place of Charles Townshend. Upon the formation of the Rockingham ministry in July 1765 Ellis resigned the latter office, and again became joint vice-treasurer of Ireland, a post which he held until September 1766, when he was succeeded by Isaac Barré. At the general election in March 1768 Ellis was elected one of the members for Petersfield, and though he strongly protested against Lord North's motion for the repeal of the American tea duty on 5 March 1770 (*ib.* xvi. 874), he was for the third time appointed joint vice-treasurer of Ireland on 21 April following. In the early months of 1771 Ellis took the principal part in the proceedings in the House of Commons against Lord Mayor Crosby [q. v.] and Alderman Oliver for obstructing the execution of the orders of the house, and it was upon his motion that they were both committed to the Tower (*ib.* vol. xvii. passim). At the general election in October 1774 he was returned for his old constituency of Weymouth, and having resigned the office of vice-treasurer in March was appointed treasurer of the navy on 12 June 1777. Ellis was again returned for Weymouth at the general election in September 1780, and at the close of Lord North's administration became on 11 Feb. 1782 the secretary of state for America, in the place of Lord George Germaine, who upon his retirement was created Viscount Sackville. His tenure of this office, which was the last he ever held under the crown, was brief, for he resigned upon the accession of Lord Rockingham to power in the following month. He continued, however, to take a considerable part in the debates of the house, and in May 1783 spoke against Pitt's resolution for reform (*ib.* xxiii. 864–5). He was again returned for Weymouth in March 1784, and twice in 1789 proposed Sir Gilbert Elliot for the speakership without success (*ib.* xxvii. 905–6, xxviii. 149–50). He failed to secure a seat at the general election in June 1790, but was returned for Petersfield at a bye election in April of the following year. Ellis, who had supported the coalition ministry, continued to oppose Pitt until 1793, when, alarmed at the progress of the French revolution, he seceded from the opposition. On the Duke of Portland becoming secretary of state in Pitt's administration Ellis was created, on 13 Aug. 1794, Baron Mendip of Mendip in the county of Somerset with remainder in default of issue to the heirs male of his sister Anne, the wife of Henry Agar of Gowran. No speech of his in the House of Lords is reported in the 'Parliamentary History.' He died at his house in Brook Street, Hanover Square, on 2 Feb. 1802 in his eighty-ninth year, and was buried at Westminster Abbey on the following Sunday in the north transept. Ellis married, first, on 18 Nov. 1747, Elizabeth, the only daughter of the Hon. Sir William Stanhope, K.B., second son of Philip, third earl of Chesterfield. She died on 1 Aug. 1761. In her right he acquired the possession of Pope's villa at Twickenham, which had been bought by her father after Pope's death in 1744. On 20 July 1765 he married, secondly, Anne, the eldest daughter of Hans Stanley of Paultons, near Romsey, Hampshire. She survived him nearly two years, and died at Twickenham on 7 Dec. 1803, in her seventy-ninth year. There were no issue of either marriage, and the barony of Mendip, in accordance with the special limitations of the patent, descended to his sister's grandson, Henry Welbore Agar, second Viscount Clifden, who thereupon assumed the additional surname of Ellis. Junius spoke of Ellis in no flattering terms, and referred to him as 'little mannikin Ellis' and 'Grildrig' (Bohn's edit. i. 288, 349); and Macaulay, in his 'Sketch of William Pitt,' sneers at him as 'an ancient placeman, who had been drawing salary almost every quarter since the days of Henry Pelham' (*Miscellaneous Writings*, 1860, ii. 316). His neighbour, Horace Walpole, was never tired of jeering at him; at one time he calls him Fox's 'Jackal,' and at another 'Forlorn Hope Ellis.' 'Wisdom,' he writes to the Countess of Ossory, 'I left forty years ago to Welbore Ellis, and must not pretend to rival him now when he is grown so rich by the semblance of it' (Walpole, *Letters*, vii. 264), and again, 'Connections make themselves, whether one will or not, but nobody can make one be a minister against one's will, unless one is of as little consequence as [Welbore] Ellis' (*ib.* viii. 169). In his amusing comparison of Barrington's character with that of Ellis, Walpole states that the latter 'had a fluency that was precise too, but it was a stream that flowed so smoothly and so shallow that it seemed to design to let every pebble it passed over be distinguished' (*Memoirs of the Reign of George II*, ii. 142). But though Ellis was not possessed of any great talents, he was readily recognised as a useful man in the house. When he entered parliament he attached himself to Henry Fox, afterwards Lord Holland, who upon becoming secretary of state in 1755 stipulated that some higher

place should be found for Ellis in the administration. Throughout his long parliamentary career Ellis consistently held to his political principles, and at the same time preserved the integrity of his character. But he was totally unfitted to fill such an important post as that of the American secretary, and the ambiguous 'Confession of Faith' which he made on entering upon the duties of that office was most severely criticised by Burke (*Parl. Hist.* xxiii. 1032-41). Ellis was created a D.C.L. of the university of Oxford on 7 July 1773, and was appointed a trustee of the British Museum in 1780. He was also a fellow of the Royal Society. His library is said to have been one of the most valuable private collections in the kingdom. His portrait, painted by Gainsborough in 1763, is now at Christ Church, Oxford; it was exhibited at the second loan collection of national portraits in 1867 (*Catalogue*, No. 489).

[Alumni Westmon. (1852), pp. 189, 297, 304–305; Cat. of Oxford Graduates (1851), p. 212; Collins's Peerage (1812), viii. 360–2; The Georgian Era (1832), i. 540; Gent. Mag. 1747, xvii. 544, 1802, vol. lxxii. pt. i. pp. 187–9, 1803, vol. lxxiii. pt. ii. p. 1192; Lord Mahon's Hist. of England, v. 401, 434, vii. 196, 201; Walpole's Memoirs of George II (1846), ii. 44, 141–2, 153; Walpole's Letters (Cunningham's edit.), iv. 94, 178, viii. 147, 262; pedigree given in the Ellis Correspondence (1829), i. xxiii; Chester's Registers of Westminster Abbey (1876), pp. 467, 469; Journals of the House of Commons, xxiv. 27, 36, 39, 40; Official Return of Lists of Members of Parliament, pt. ii. 93, 100, 112, 123, 142, 151, 164, 178, 193; Haydn's Book of Dignities.] G. F. R. B.

ELLIS, Sir WILLIAM (1609–1680), judge, second son of Sir Thomas Ellis of Grantham, Lincolnshire, and probably nephew of Sir William Ellis, one of the council of the north in 1619, born in 1609, was educated at Caius College, Cambridge, graduating B.A. in 1632 and M.A. in 1636. Having entered Gray's Inn on 6 Nov. 1627 he was called to the bar on 9 Feb. 1634. He represented Boston, Lincolnshire, in the Short parliament of 1640, and also in the Long parliament. His name does not appear in Rushworth's list (*Hist. Coll.* vii. 1355) of the members excluded by Colonel Pride on 6 Dec. 1648; but it is not unlikely that he was one of those 'others from the Inns of Court' who 'had liberty granted to go to their chambers on their parole' on the 12th, as he was readmitted to the House of Commons on 4 June 1649 (*ib.* 1361). On 24 May 1654 he was appointed solicitor-general. Shortly afterwards he was elected an ancient of his inn. As solicitor-general he took part in the prosecution of Gerhard, Vowell, and Somerset Fox on the charge of corresponding with Charles Stuart and conspiring to assassinate the Protector. The trial took place in June 1654. Gerhard and Vowell were convicted and beheaded. The same year he was again returned to parliament for Boston, and in 1656 for Grantham. He was a member of the committee appointed to frame statutes for Durham College in March 1655-6. In June 1658 he was engaged in the prosecution of Dr. Hewet and John Mordant, charged with levying war against the Protector. Hewet was found guilty and Mordant acquitted. One of Cromwell's latest acts was to sign a patent creating Ellis a baronet, but it is doubtful whether it passed the great seal. He was continued in the office of solicitor-general by Richard Cromwell. At the election in January 1658–9 he retained his seat for Grantham. In the protracted debate on the competency of the Scottish members he spoke at length in support of their claims (18 March 1658–9), observing that the 'argument that the Act of Union is no good law, this argument makes way for Charles Stuart' (Burton, *Diary*, iv. 181). Re-elected for Grantham in 1660 he was excluded from the house on the score of his opinions. In autumn 1664 he was appointed reader at Gray's Inn, of which he had been elected a bencher in 1659; on 26 Aug. 1669 he took the degree of serjeant-at-law, and on 10 April 1671 he was advanced to the rank of king's serjeant and knighted. He was raised to the bench in 1673, taking his seat in the court of common pleas on the first day of Hilary term. The only case of public interest which came before him during his tenure of office was that of Barnardiston *v.* Swaine (*State Trials*, vi. 1070), an election case. Sir Samuel Barnardiston and Lord Huntingtower contested the county of Suffolk in 1673. Barnardiston having the majority of votes, Lord Huntingtower induced the sheriff to falsify the return, and took his seat in the house. There the case was decided by an election committee, and Barnardiston declared elected. Accordingly he sued Lord Huntingtower for 'trespass on the case,' and recovered 1,000*l.* damages in the king's bench. The case was, however, removed on writ of error to the exchequer chamber, where the majority, Ellis and Atkins dissenting, reversed the judgment of the king's bench. Ellis was removed in 1676, without reason assigned, but reinstated on 5 May 1679, having been returned to parliament for Boston in the preceding February. He died on 3 Dec. 1680 at his chambers in Serjeants' Inn, according to Sir Thomas Ray-

mond, 'grandævus senectute, viz. ætat. 71.' His arms are emblazoned in the bay window of Gray's Inn Hall.

[Cal. State Papers, Dom. (1640–1) p. 310, (1655–6) p. 218; Grad. Cant.; Douthwaite's Gray's Inn; Willis's Not. Parl. iii. 233, 246, 263, 276; Lists of Members of Parliament (official return of); 4th Rep. Dep.-Keeper Pat. Rec. App. ii. 190; Foss's Lives of the Judges; Wood's Fasti (Bliss), i. 446; Noble's Cromwell, i. 437, 442; Parl. Hist. iv. 4, 1080; Sir Thomas Raymond's Rep. 217, 251, 407.] J. M. R.

ELLIS, Sir WILLIAM (*d.* 1732), secretary of state, second son of John Ellis (1606?–1681) [q. v.], was educated on the foundation of Westminster, whence he was elected to a studentship at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1665, and proceeded B.A. 19 June 1669. He lost his studentship for accepting the degree of M.A. 'per literas regias' at Cambridge in 1671, without having first obtained his grace in his own college; and, despite the intercession of the Prince of Orange, in whose train he had visited Cambridge, was never restored. In 1678 he was appointed, along with his brother, Welbore Ellis, customer, comptroller and searcher for the provinces of Leinster and Munster (*Addit. MS.* 21135, f. 53), and while holding this lucrative sinecure acquired considerable property in Ireland (*ib.* 28930, 28938, 28940, 28941, 28946). He acted as secretary to Richard, earl of Tyrconnel, on the latter's appointment to the lord-lieutenancy of Ireland in 1686, and was knighted. At the revolution he elected to follow the fortunes of the house of Stuart. Accompanying James to Ireland he was placed on his privy council and appointed one of the assessors for the city and county of Dublin in April 1690 (D'Alton, *King James's Irish Army List*, 2nd ed. i. 33, ii. 692, where he is confounded with Sir William Ellis, 'solicitor-general for Ireland in 1657 and one of the baronets created by Cromwell'). He was attainted in 1691, and his elder brother, John [q. v.], to whom he owed money, gained possession of his Irish property. He afterwards became secretary to James in his exile at St. Germain, and on his death in 1701 acted as treasurer to his son, the Old Pretender. Ellis died a protestant at Rome in the autumn of 1732, aged between 85 and 90 (*Gent. Mag.* ii. 930). His letters to his brother John and others (1674–1689) are in the British Museum, Addit. MSS. 28930–1, 28875–6; those to Cardinal Gualterio (1719–27) will be found in Addit. MSS. 20310, 31267.

[Ellis Correspondence, ed. Hon. G. J. W. Agar Ellis, 1829; Welch's Alumni Westmon. 1852, p. 161; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ed. Bliss, iii. 711; Gent. Mag. xxxix. 328; Oxford Graduates, 1851, p. 212; Cambridge Graduates, 1787, p. 130.] G. G.

ELLIS, WILLIAM (1747–1810), engraver, born in London in 1747, was the son of a writing engraver, and was placed as a pupil with W. Woollett [q. v.] He produced some fine plates in the style of that celebrated engraver, some being executed in conjunction with him, viz. the two portraits of Rubens and his wife, published in 1774; 'A River Scene with a Windmill,' after S. Ruysdael, published in 1777; 'Solitude,' after R. Wilson, R.A., published in 1778; and two scenes from the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' after T. Hearne, published in 1780, and exhibited at the Society of Artists in that year. Ellis engraved several topographical views after Paul Sandby and T. Hearne, a set of 'The Seasons,' after Hearne, and some plates for the 'Ladies' Magazine.' In 1800 he aquatinted a set of engravings of 'Views of the Memorable Victory of the Nile,' engraved by F. Chesham from paintings by W. Anderson. Some of his engravings, e.g. a landscape, 'Peasants Dancing,' after Berchem, are signed 'William and Elizabeth Ellis,' and a plate of 'The Solitary Traveller,' after J. Pye, is stated to be etched by Elizabeth Ellis alone. She was no doubt his wife, and assisted him in his art. Ellis died in 1810, as is shown from the inscription on a plate representing 'A South View of the City of Exeter, from a Drawing taken at Shooting Marsh by the late Mr. William Ellis,' published 24 Nov. 1810, in aid of his five orphan children. In 1814 there was published a set of 'Twenty-nine Views illustrative of the Rev. Daniel Lysons's Environs of London, drawn and engraved by William Ellis.'

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Le Blanc's Manuel de l'Amateur d'Estampes; Fagan's Catalogue Raisonné of the engraved works of William Woollett; Lowndes's Bibl. Man.] L. C.

ELLIS, WILLIAM (*d.* 1758), was a writer on agriculture, of whom little save his books has survived. He is supposed to have been born about 1700, received an ordinary education, and began life as a plain farmer. For nearly fifty years he held a farm at Little Gaddesden, Hertfordshire, on which, however, he made no pretence to scientific agriculture. His early works brought him into 'repute,' and many applications were made to him by landed proprietors in all parts of the country to visit and report on their farms. Thus he travelled over the north of England in order to give those who complied with his terms the benefit of his experience. Ellis seems to have been a shrewd man of busi-

ness, for he soon added to his income by frequently travelling as an agent for seeds and seller of farming implements; in short he was ready to execute any sort of country business at a fixed price. Many eager farmers, led by his fame and his books, proceeded to visit Ellis's farm, but found, to their surprise and disappointment, that he did not carry out any of the views which he advocated in print, that his implements were old-fashioned, and that his land was neglected and in bad condition. This report speedily reacted on the sale of his books. They had introduced many new methods of treating manure, sheep and turnips, and lucerne, but now their reputation began to decline. Ellis perceived with sorrow that he was outliving his fame.

The success which his work on timber obtained (it ran through three editions in less than three years) tempted Osborne, the bookseller, to engage him as a writer, and Ellis produced with much fecundity volume after volume. Gradually he advanced to monthly works and more voluminous productions, in which, to fill up his stipulated number of pages, he was driven to introduce those ridiculous anecdotes and unnecessary details which have so much marred his writings. So long as Ellis proceeded according to his own rule (Preface to *Farriery*), 'I always considered experience as the only touchstone of truth, and by that unerring rule every particular here advanced has been sufficiently tried,' all was well, and his books were valued accordingly. But the editor of his last book was compelled before printing it to exclude many foolish stories of gipsies, thieves, and the like, also many absurd nostrums and receipts, evidently only inserted to fill space. Ellis's books have become useless, from the advance in agricultural science.

Ellis's works consist of: 1. 'Chiltern and Vale Farming,' 1733. 2. 'New Experiments in Husbandry for the Month of April,' 1736. 3. 'The Timber-Tree Improved,' 1738. These last two are tracts. 4. 'The Shepherd's Sure Guide,' 1749; full of fatuous anecdotes of sheep and dogs. 5. 'The Modern Husbandman,' 8 vols., 1750. This treats of the farmer's year month by month and of rural economy in general; it is Ellis's best work, though such a sentence as 'Be yourself the first man up in a morning for sounding at your door your harvest horn to call your men at four o'clock,' contrasts amusingly with the writer's own practice according to those who went to visit him at Little Gaddesden. 6. 'The Country Housewife's Family Companion,' 1750. 7. 'The Practical Farmer,' 1759; an abbreviation of No. 5. 8. 'Every Farmer his own Farrier,' 1759. 9. 'Husbandry Abridged and Methodized,' 2 vols., 1772.

[Life prefixed to No. 9 above; Brit. Mus. Cat.; Ellis's own works.] M. G. W.

ELLIS, WILLIAM (1794–1872), missionary, born in London 29 Aug. 1794, of parents in straitened circumstances, was bred a gardener, but, coming under deep religious impressions, offered himself as a foreign missionary to the London Missionary Society; was accepted, trained, and ordained in 1815 for the office, and appointed first to South Africa, but afterwards to the South Sea Islands. Leaving England in 1816, along with his wife, he arrived in 1817 at Eimeo, one of the Georgian or Windward islands, and in the following year commenced a new mission at Huahine. In 1822 he removed to Oahu, one of the Sandwich group, but had to leave it owing to his wife's health; returned to England in 1825, visiting America by the way. As a Polynesian missionary he combined great spiritual earnestness with mechanical skill, and likewise with a profound interest in scientific and antiquarian research. While in England he published a 'Tour through Hawaii,' and thereafter his 'Polynesian Researches.' The 'Researches' excited great interest; the book was reviewed in the 'Quarterly Review' by Southey, whose judgment was given in the words, 'A more interesting book we have never perused.' The publication of this work went far to redeem the character of missionaries in the eyes of some who had thought of them all as ignorant and narrow-minded men. In 1830 he was appointed assistant foreign secretary to the London Missionary Society, and soon after chief foreign secretary. Among other literary employments he became editor of an annual called 'The Christian Keepsake,' which brought him into connection with many literary friends.

His first wife having died in 1835 after many years of great suffering, he married in 1837 Miss Sarah Stickney, a lady who acquired considerable literary fame, chiefly in connection with a work entitled 'The Poetry of Life,' and works on the women of England in their various relations. Miss Stickney had been brought up a member of the Society of Friends, but not caring to accept all their principles and rules, she had left that body and become a member of the congregational church. Her husband and she enjoyed five-and-thirty years of married life, marked by great congeniality of taste and pursuit, both in religion and general culture. The list of her books appended to this notice attests the variety of her accomplishments

and her great literary activity. Among the practical objects in which she and her husband were deeply interested was the promotion of temperance, and their zeal in this cause took a very practical form, several persons given to drunkenness being taken in hand and encouraged by every contrivance of affectionate solicitude to turn from their evil ways. Mrs. Ellis likewise instituted a school for young ladies—Rawdon House, to which she gave the benefit of her personal superintendence. Her object was to apply the principles illustrated in her books (*The Women of England*, &c.) to the moral training, the formation of character, and in some degree the domestic duties of young ladies. Other means were devised for improving the intellectual condition of young women of the lower classes. She had studied art both in theory and in practice, and her character and attainments gave her a position of no ordinary influence.

The profoundest interest of both her and her husband, however, was all the while in the cause of christian missions. While Ellis was secretary of the London Missionary Society the affairs of Madagascar began to create interest, both in connection with the persecution of the christian converts under Queen Ranavolona, and the interference of the French in the affairs of the island. Ellis was requested by the directors of the society to prepare a 'History of Madagascar,' which appeared in 2 vols. in 1838. In 1844 he was obliged, owing to ill-health, to resign the post of secretary. In the same year he published the first volume of a 'History of the London Missionary Society.' In 1847 he was invited to take the pastoral charge of an independent congregation at Hoddesdon in Hertfordshire, where he and his family had been residing for some time.

In 1852 the affairs of Madagascar had reached such a crisis that Ellis was requested by the directors of the society to visit the island, in order to ascertain and improve the condition of the christians. When he arrived in 1853 he was not allowed to proceed to the capital. He retired for a time to Mauritius; visited Madagascar a second time, and was again refused access to the capital. Before he arrived in England communications reached him indicating that a change had come over the authorities, and conveying their invitation to him to visit them. Without hesitation he retraced his steps, and paid his third visit in 1856. Yet even now the queen would not allow him to extend his visit beyond a month, and though he was able to learn a good deal, he could not do what he had desired either for the country or the christian cause. Soon after his return from this third visit the queen died, and matters assumed quite a different appearance. In 1861 Ellis set out on his fourth, and by far his longest and most satisfactory visit to Madagascar, and remained in the island till 1865. The events that followed are well known. In 1868 a christian queen came to the throne, advised by christian counsellors. Persecution being exchanged for encouragement, an immense addition to the number of persons professing christianity took place. The continuance of the plots of the French created great difficulties in the political government. Ellis was able to give advice by which these difficulties were in a great measure overcome. Both church matters and state matters were settled on a basis which provided for self-government, constitutional liberty, and the freedom of the church. When he returned to England in 1865 he received an extraordinary welcome. A great part of his time was spent in going from place to place and delivering lectures and addresses. Three books, entitled 'Three Visits to Madagascar' (1858), 'Madagascar Revisited' (1867), and 'The Martyr Church of Madagascar' (1870), gave full particulars of the whole movement.

In the beginning of June 1872 he caught cold on a railway journey and died on the 9th of the month. Scarcely had he been buried, when Mrs. Ellis was seized with precisely the same form of ailment, and died on the 16th.

The principal works of Ellis have been already noticed. Those published by Mrs. Ellis were the following: 1. 'The Poetry of Life,' 2 vols. 2. 'Conversations on Human Nature.' 3. 'Home, or the Iron Rule,' 3 vols. 4. 'The Women of England.' 5. 'Sons of the Soil,' a poem. 6. 'The Daughters of England.' 7. 'The Wives of England.' 8. 'The Mothers of England.' 9. 'Family Secrets,' 3 vols. 10. 'A Summer and a Winter in the Pyrenees.' 11. 'A Voice from the Vintage.' 12. 'Pictures of Private Life.' 13. 'The Young Ladies' Reader.' 14. 'Look to the End,' 2 vols. 15. 'The Island Queen,' a poem. 16. 'Temper and Temperament,' 2 vols. 17. 'Prevention better than Cure.' 18. 'Rawdon House.' 19. 'Fireside Tales.' 20. 'Social Distinction,' 3 vols. 21. 'My Brother.' 22. 'The Beautiful in Nature and Art.' 23. 'Northern Roses,' 3 vols. 24. 'Education of Character.' 25. 'Education of the Heart.' 26. 'The Morning Call, a table-book of Literature and Art,' 4 vols.

[Memoir of Rev. William Ellis, by his son, John E. Ellis, 1873; Register of Missionaries, &c., of the London Missionary Society, by J. O. Whitehouse, 1886.] W. G. B.

ELLIS, WILLIAM (1800–1881), economist, was born in January 1800. His father, Andrew Ellis Ellis, an underwriter at Lloyd's, was the descendant of a French refugee family named De Vezian, and took the name Ellis shortly after the son's birth. His mother was Maria Sophia Fazio, of Italian extraction. He was educated at a school in Bromley, and at the age of fourteen became his father's assistant at Lloyd's. In 1824, on the foundation of the Indemnity Marine Insurance Company, he became assistant-underwriter. In 1827 he was appointed chief manager of the company, and held that position for many years, until on his retirement he was elected director. He was a most energetic and successful man of business, never taking a holiday for thirty years. He found time, however, to write many books and take an active part in teaching. He was interested in economic speculations, and joined the Utilitarian Society formed by John Stuart Mill, a body never exceeding ten in number, and lasting only from the winter of 1822–3 to 1826. His fellow-members included William Eyton Tooke, son of the economical writer, and John Arthur Roebuck. He joined Mill in another informal club for the discussion of economic questions about 1825–30, and was one of those who 'originated new speculations.' Ellis was through life a member of the school of economists led by Mill, and became conspicuous for what Mill calls his 'apostolic exertions for the improvement of education.' He was especially impressed by the importance of teaching political economy to children. He endeavoured to enforce this theory with great simplicity and earnestness, both in writing and by practice. In 1846 he tried a conversation class upon economic subjects in a British school. His success encouraged him to form a class of schoolmasters. In 1848 he founded the first Birkbeck school. In 1852 he had founded five of these schools at his own expense, naming them after George Birkbeck [q. v.] At one time there were ten of these schools. He appointed trustees and provided endowments, but only two now remain (1888). The Peckham school had at one time eight hundred pupils. He afterwards helped to found, and was a governor of, the school of the Middle-class Corporation, to which he contributed munificently until his death. At the request of the prince consort he gave lectures to the royal children at Buckingham Palace. Some lectures written by him were read in several towns at the expense of Brougham. He wrote a series of text-books for the advancement of his favourite science. The best known was 'Lessons on the Phenomena of Industrial Life,' edited by Dean Dawes.

His chief works are: 1. 'Outlines of Social Economy,' 1846. 2. 'Education as a means of Preventing Destitution,' 1851. 3. 'A Layman's Contribution to the Knowledge and Practice of Religion in Common Life,' 1857 (really an exposition of economical principles). 4. 'Where must we look for the further Prevention of Crime?' 1857. 5. 'Philo-Socrates' (a series of papers), 1861. 6. 'Introduction to the Study of the Social Sciences,' 1863 (a lecture at University College). 7. 'Thoughts on the Future of the Human Race,' 1866. 8. 'What stops the Way? or the two great difficulties,' 1868. Ellis also contributed the article upon 'Marine Insurance' to the first edition of McCulloch's 'Commercial Dictionary.' Some of his books have been translated and two of them were introduced into the primary schools in France. He died, aged 81, on 18 Feb. 1881. He married in 1825 Mary, third daughter of the historian Sharon Turner. She died in 1870, and he survived his two sons.

[Times, 22 Feb. 1881; Athenæum, 1881, pt. i., p. 336; Good Words for August 1881; J. S. Mill's Autobiography, pp. 81, 121, 125; W. Rogers's Reminiscences (1888), p. 86; Bain's James Mill, pp. 182, 389, 392; Walford's Insurance Cyclopædia; information from his daughter, Mrs. Durham. An article by George Combe [q.v.] in the Westminster Review for July 1852 describes his teaching.]

ELLIS, WYNNE (1790–1875), picture collector, son of Thomas Ellis, by Elizabeth Ordway of Barkway, Hertfordshire, was born at Oundle, Northamptonshire, in July 1790, and after receiving a good education came to London. In 1812 he became a haberdasher, hosier, and mercer at 16 Ludgate Street, city of London, where he gradually created the largest silk business in London, adding house to house as opportunity occurred of purchasing the property around him, and passing from the retail to a wholesale business in 1830. After his retirement in 1871 his firm assumed the title of John Howell & Co.

In 1831 he withdrew his candidature for the aldermanic ward of Castle Baynard to contest the parliamentary representation of Leicester. As an advanced liberal he sat for Leicester from 4 May 1831 to 29 Dec. 1834, and again from 22 March 1839 to 23 July 1847. He was an advocate for the total repeal of the corn laws, of free trade generally, of reform in bankruptcy, and of greater freedom in the law of partnership. In the committees of the House of Commons he exercised considerable influence. He was a J.P. both for Hertfordshire and Kent, and was pricked to serve as sheriff for the latter county, but was excused in consideration of his having discharged corresponding duties for Hertford-

shire in 1851–2. He purchased the manor of Ponsborne Park, Hertfordshire, in 1836, but sold it in May 1875. He also owned Tankerton Tower, near Canterbury. He had an intense dislike to betting, horseracing, and gambling, though he was a lover of manly sports. He made an extensive collection of ancient and modern pictures, many of which are described in Waagen's 'Treasures of Art,' ii. 293–8. He married in 1814 Mary Maria, daughter of John Smith of Lincoln. She died in 1872, and was buried in a mausoleum designed by Barry, and built in Whitstable churchyard. Near this her husband soon after erected almshouses to her memory. He died at his residence, 30 Cadogan Place, Sloane Street, London, 20 Nov. 1875, and was buried with his wife at Whitstable. By his will he left very numerous legacies to charitable and religious institutions, including 50,000*l.* to the trustees of the Simeon Fund. His personalty was proved under 600,000*l.* on 8 Jan. 1876. His ancient pictures, 402 in number, he left to the English nation, but of these the trustees of the National Gallery selected only 44, which have since been exhibited as the Wynne Ellis collection. The remainder of these ancient pictures, with his modern pictures, water-colour drawings, porcelain, decorative furniture, marbles, &c., were disposed of at Christie, Manson, & Wood's in five days' sale in May, June, and July 1876, when the total proceeds were 56,098*l.* 2*s.* 3*d.* In the sale of 6 May Gainsborough's portrait of Elizabeth, duchess of Devonshire, was purchased by Thomas Agnew & Sons for 10,605*l.* The Agnews exhibited the painting at their rooms, 39B Old Bond Street, London, where on the night of 26 May it was cut out of the stretching-frame and stolen. A reward of 1,000*l.* was offered in vain for its recovery.

[Warehousemen and Drapers' Trade Journal, 27 Nov. 1875, p. 618, 11 Dec. p. 641, and 25 Dec. p. 660; Illustrated London News, 8 Jan. 1876, pp. 35, 37, 38 with portrait, 13 May, p. 475, 20 May, p. 500, and 3 June, p. 550; Times, 25 Nov. 1875, 5, 8, 19, 22, 27, 29 May, 20 June, 18 and 19 July 1876; Cussans's Hertfordshire (1874), ii. part iii. 271; Annual Register, 1876, p. 402, and Chronicle, p. 51.] G. C. B.

ELLISTON, HENRY TWISELTON (1801?–1864), musical composer and inventor, born in or about 1801, was the second son of Robert William Elliston [q. v.], and resided during most of his life at Leamington, where his father had formerly leased the theatre. Having decided on adopting music as his profession, he received a careful training, and became a sound theoretical musician, and an able performer on the organ and several other instruments. On his father presenting an organ to the parish church of Leamington, Elliston was elected organist, and held the post till his death. In the subsequent enlargement of the organ he exhibited considerable mechanical ingenuity, and invented a transposing piano on a new and simple plan. He was an early member of the choral society of Leamington, and whilst he was associated with it the society produced the 'Messiah' and other great works during a three days' musical festival. Elliston himself built the music hall in Bath Street. With his brother William, who emigrated to Australia, he established the County Library. During the time that he and his brother were in partnership they gave concerts on an extensive scale. Subsequently Elliston was lessee of the royal assembly rooms. Beyond some admired church services he composed little. In September 1683 he was appointed librarian of the free public library at Leamington. He died at Leamington 19 April 1864, aged 63, and was buried in the cemetery.

[Gent. Mag. 3rd ser. xvi. 807–8.] G. G.

ELLISTON, ROBERT WILLIAM (1774–1831), actor, was born 7 April 1774 in Orange Street, Bloomsbury, where his father, Robert Elliston, who subsequently removed to Charles Street, Long Acre, was in business as a watchmaker. His grandfather was a farmer at Gedgrave, near Orford, Suffolk. Robert Elliston the elder was a man of indolent habits and low pursuits, and the charge of the education of his son at St. Paul's School, Covent Garden, devolved upon his brother, William Elliston, LL.D., master of Sidney College, Cambridge. The youth, who passed his holidays in Cambridge with his uncle, Dr. Elliston, or with his uncle by marriage, the Rev. Thomas Martyn, professor of botany at Sidney College, was intended for the church. While at school about 1790 at an evening academy kept by a Madame Cotterille, at which he studied French, he made in a private building a species of histrionic essay, playing Pyrrhus in 'The Distressed Mother,' to the Phœnix of Charles Mathews, and Chamont in 'The Orphan.' More ambitious efforts followed at the Lyceum Rooms, where he enacted Young Norval, Pierre, and other characters in tragedy. Early in 1791 he ran away from home with an introduction to Dimond, manager of the Bath Theatre. Failing to obtain an engagement he accepted a situation as clerk to a lottery office. On 14 April 1791, according to Genest, who describes him 'as a young gentleman, his first appearance on any stage,' he played Tressel in 'Richard III' at the Bath Theatre. This character he repeated with the

same company at Bristol on the 25th. On the 28th he acted at Bath Arviragus in 'Cymbeline.' Raymond fixes his first appearance at 21 April 1792 (*Life of Elliston*, i. 39). An engagement was then accepted from Tate Wilkinson of the York circuit, and Elliston appeared at Leeds in 1792 as Dorilas in 'Merope.' Dissatisfied with the parts assigned him, he apologised for his escapade to Dr. Elliston, and was taken back into favour. In May 1793 he returned to London and made the acquaintance of Dr. Farmer and George Steevens, by the latter of whom he was introduced to John Kemble, who, July 1793, with the idea of giving him an engagement at Drury Lane, recommended him to study Romeo. As the new theatre was not ready, Elliston reappeared at Bath 26 Sept. 1793 in Romeo. He now sprang into favour, playing at Bath or Bristol a large number of characters in tragedy and comedy. In Bath Elliston eloped with and married, about June 1796, a Miss Rundall, a teacher of dancing, by whom he had a large family, and who, in the height of his success, continued her occupation. On 25 June 1796, by permission of Dimond, to whom he was engaged for three years, Elliston made what was probably his first appearance in London, playing at the Haymarket, under Colman, Octavian in 'The Mountaineers,' and Vapour in Prince Hoare's musical farce 'My Grandmother.' 'The Iron Chest,' the failure of which at Drury Lane, 12 March 1796, had elicited Colman's famous preface attacking Kemble, was revived at the Haymarket 29 Aug., when Elliston obtained warm recognition in Kemble's character of Sir Edward Mortimer. He also played Romeo. On 21 Sept. 1796 (Raymond, 1797) at Covent Garden, still by permission of Dimond, he appeared for one night only as Sheva in 'The Jew.' At the same house he played Young Norval and Philaster. The curious arrangement by which Dimond of Bath allowed him to appear in London once a fortnight subjected the actor to some ridicule. Bath remained his headquarters, all the leading business being gradually assigned him. He played by command before George III at Windsor, and also appeared at Weymouth, where by playing on the violin he awoke the king, who in the afternoon had retired into the royal box and fallen asleep. He also delivered at Wells and elsewhere an entertainment with songs, &c., written for him by Thomas Dibdin. During his frequent visits to London he had become a member of several clubs and acquired habits of gambling and dissipation. During the recess at Bath he managed the small theatres at Wells and Shepton Mallet. Having vainly taken some steps towards obtaining a patent for a new London theatre, and made a fruitless application to the vice-chancellor of Oxford for permission to open a theatre in that city, he accepted an engagement from Colman at the Haymarket, at which house he appeared 16 May 1803 in 'No Prelude,' which Genest assigns to Elliston and Waldron, and in 'The Jew' as Sheva, his old associate Mathews making as Jabal his first appearance in London. At the Haymarket he played during the summer seasons of 1803, 1804, 1805, and 1811. His début at Drury Lane took place 20 Sept. 1804 as Rolla in 'Pizarro.' He remained a member of the Drury Lane company until 1809, returned to it 1812-15 and again 1819–26. During the period last named he was lessee and manager of the theatre, from which in 1826 he retired ruined. His characters included most leading parts in the ancient and modern repertories of the two theatres. Among the many original parts in works by Dimond, Dibdin, Kenney, and other dramatists he played at Drury Lane, the most important are Fitzharding in Tobin's 'The Curfew,' 19 Feb. 1807, and Lothair in 'Adelgitha,' by 'Monk' Lewis, 30 April 1807. So great was the popularity of Elliston that he was compelled for his benefit, 10 Sept. 1804, to take the King's Theatre, and the public breaking through all obstacles rushed in without paying, and crowded the house in all parts, including the stage (Oulton, *History of the Theatres of London*, iii. 55–7). At the close of the season of 1808–9 at Drury Lane Elliston entered upon the management of the Royal Circus, which he subsequently called the Surrey Theatre. At the time when the theatre opened, Easter 1809, Elliston was engaged with the Drury Lane company, then, in consequence of the destruction of their theatre by fire, playing at the Lyceum. He did not appear accordingly at the Surrey until 16 June 1809, when he played Macheath in a burletta founded on the 'Beggar's Opera,' itself a burlesque. The next performance was as Macbeth, in a burletta on that tragedy. The following season, the theatre having been converted into the Surrey, Miss Sally Booth [q. v.] appeared in a burletta founded on the 'Beaux' Stratagem,' in which Elliston was Archer. While the house was closed Elliston meanwhile had undertaken the management of the theatres at Manchester and Birmingham, and had opened in 1811, in John Street, Bristol, a 'Literary Association' connected with a shop for the sale of secondhand books. A bloodless duel with De Camp the actor belongs to September 1812. On 19 April 1813, while still retaining the Surrey, he opened, under the

title of Little Drury Lane, the Olympic Pavilion, which in the following month was closed by order of the lord chamberlain. In December it was reopened as the Olympic. Elliston also managed for a season the Leicester theatre, and undertook other theatrical or quasi-theatrical speculations. When the new theatre in Drury Lane reopened 10 Oct. 1812, Elliston spoke Byron's prologue and acted Hamlet. After refusing the management of Drury Lane, which was offered him by the committee, he secured, in a competition with Kean, Dibdin, Arnold, and others, the lesseeship of the house. His management was spirited. He made at the outset an application to Mrs. Siddons, who refused to be drawn from her retirement, engaged, in addition to other actors, Kean, Pope, Holland, Dowton, Munden, Harley, Oxberry, Knight, Braham, Mrs. West, Mrs. Egerton, Mrs. Glover, Miss Kelly, Mrs. Edwin, and subsequently Madame Vestris, and applied for dramas to Sir Walter Scott, Maturin, and other authors of repute. Drury Lane opened under Elliston's management, 4 Oct. 1819, with 'Wild Oats,' in which he played Rover. Kean during the season appeared for the first time as Lear and Jaffier; versions of novels of Scott were produced, and Madame Vestris obtained a success in the revival of 'Don Giovanni' in London. After closing 8 July 1820, the theatre reopened 15 Aug. for a series of farewell performances of Kean before that actor's departure to America, and did not finally close until 16 Sept. The principal event of the following season was the production, 25 April 1821, in the face of much opposition, of Lord Byron's 'Marino Faliero.' Towards the close of the season, which lasted through the summer, Kean reappeared. Young was engaged in 1822–3, and Macready, who appeared as Virginius, in 1823–4. Kean also played occasionally, but many causes combined to render his appearances casual and uncertain. To Elliston's engagement of Clarkson Stanfield and David Roberts Drury Lane owed the reputation for scenery it long enjoyed. At the close of the season 1825–1826 Elliston, unable to meet the claims of the committee of Drury Lane, was compelled to resign the theatre, the management of which was for a time entrusted to his son, and on 10 Dec. 1826 he appeared as a bankrupt. Mrs. Elliston had died 1 April 1821 in her forty-sixth year, and been buried in St. George's burial-ground, Bayswater. In January 1823 Elliston had an epileptic seizure. A second attack, the nature of which is not defined, left him, in August 1825, 'a helpless, decrepit, tottering old man' (*Life* by Raymond). On 11 May 1826 he appeared at Drury Lane as Falstaff in the 'First Part of King Henry IV.' He showed signs of exhaustion, and in the fifth act fell flat on the stage. This was his last appearance at Drury Lane. After quitting this house Elliston became once more lessee of the Surrey, at which he appeared Whit-Monday 1827 as 'The Three Singles,' playing a triple character, in which he was in turns a collegian, a Frenchman, and a fool. Falstaff and other characters followed, the result being financially successful. The engagement of T. P. Cooke and the production in 1829 of Douglas Jerrold's 'Black-Eyed Susan' were features in his management of the Surrey. At this time he had recovered a portion of his old spirits, and was still 'the first comedian of his day.' His health was, however, shattered. On 24 June 1831 he played Sheva in 'The Jew,' and struggled with difficulty through the character. This was his last performance. He had an apoplectic seizure 6 July 1831, and on the 8th, at 6.30 a.m., at Great Surrey Street, Blackfriars, he died. Elliston is buried in a vault in St. John's Church, Waterloo Road. A marble slab, with a Latin epitaph by his son-in-law, Nicholas Torre, was placed in August 1833 on the south side of the church.

Few actors have occupied a more important place than Elliston, and few have exhibited more diversified talent or a more perplexing individuality. In the main he was an honest, well-meaning man. His weakness in the presence of temptation led him into terrible irregularities; his animal spirits and habits of intoxication combined made him the hero of the most preposterous adventures; and his assumption of dignity, and his marvellous system of puffing, cast upon one of the first of actors a reputation not far from that of a 'charlatan.' In his management of Drury Lane he acquired the respect of a portion at least of his contemporaries, the general estimate being that he sacrificed his own fortune, which he states in a note to the preface to 'The Flying Dutchman' to have been 30,000*l.*, to the interests of the proprietors, by whom he was treated with ingratitude. It was in the management of minor and provincial theatres, into which he recklessly plunged, that he played the preposterous or diverting pranks which cling to his memory. Pages might be filled with the record of his pretensions and his absurdities. His merits as an actor cannot be challenged. The rhapsody 'To the Shade of Elliston,' beginning 'Joyousest of once embodied spirits,' and the praise of his various performances, are among the most familiar of Lamb's utterances concerning the stage. Leigh Hunt declares Elliston 'the only genius that has approached that great

man (Garrick) in universality of imitation,' and speaks of him (1807) as 'the second tragedian on the stage,' and the 'best lover on the stage both in tragedy and comedy.' Macready, sparing as he is of praise to rivals, in giving a striking account of Elliston's last performance at Drury Lane (*Reminiscences*, i. 307–8), writes a high encomium of his versatility and power. The 'London Magazine and Theatrical Inquisitor,' iii. 515, says his comic genius was irresistible. It was the very apotheosis of fun, sworn brother 'to all frolicsomeness,' but adds that in his later years he had fallen into 'a coarse buffoonery of manner;' and Byron says he could conceive nothing better than Elliston in gentlemanly comedy and in some parts of tragedy. Vapid in 'The Dramatist,' Doricourt, Charles Surface, Rover in 'Wild Oats,' and Ranger in the 'Suspicious Husband,' are a few of the comic characters in which he had no equal. Among his serious parts the best were Hamlet, Orestes, Romeo, Hotspur, Amintor. In addition to 'No Prelude' before mentioned Elliston wrote the 'Venetian Outlaw,' 8vo, 1805, acted at Drury Lane 26 April 1805, the author playing the part of Vivaldi. It is dedicated from Elliston's residence, 13 North Street, Westminster, to the king, is fairly workmanlike, and is, according to a postscript by Elliston to the printed edition, an adaptation of Abelin's 'Le Grand Bandit ou l'Homme à trois Masques,' a piece played at the Duke's Theatre, Brunswick. He wrote a preface to the 'Flying Dutchman, or the Spectral Ship,' a three-act drama played at the Surrey, and included in the third volume of Richardson's 'New Minor Theatre,' 12mo, 1828, et seq., and two letters, one of them being a reply to a memorial to the lord chamberlain against the Olympic and the Sans Pareil theatres, presented by the managements of Drury Lane and Covent Garden. These are printed in octavo, London, 1818, with the memorial, and are in the British Museum under 'Drury Lane.' An acting edition of 'Coriolanus,' London, 1820, is said to be altered by R. W. Elliston. A preface to Poole's 'Married and Single,' 8vo, 1824, contains an attack upon him. No. 2 in the Mathews collection of paintings at the Garrick Club is a portrait by Henry Singleton, R.A., of Elliston as Octavian in 'The Mountaineers.' Mathews, in the 'Catalogue,' writes, 'A most fascinating, brilliant actor.' Other portraits by De Wilde, as Duke Aranza in 'The Honeymoon,' and by Harlowe show him a handsome, bright-looking man. He is charged with being a little of a fop, but was a good conversationalist, and without being witty had a fund of humour. He had a gift of facile oratory which he frequently abused. On the strength of this he contemplated at different times entering parliament and the church. His habit of addressing the public frequently with most mendacious intentions subjected him to much well-deserved ridicule. Those extravagances which most embroiled him with a portion of the public were forgiven him by another portion as due to waywardness of humour rather than any other cause. Among the contents of a curiosity shop was once preserved a series of his cancelled cheques issued while manager of Drury Lane. The progressive unsteadiness and illegibility of the writing furnished a curious commentary on the drunken habits of the writer.

[Raymond's Memoirs of Elliston, 2 vols. 1845; Genest's Account of the Stage; Moore's Life of Byron, 1822; Baker, Reed, and Jones's Biographia Dramatica; Mathews's Anecdotes of Actors; Sir F. Pollock's Macready's Reminiscences; New Monthly Magazine; London Magazine; Monthly Mirror; Theatrical Inquisitor, passim; Leigh Hunt's Critical Essays on the Performers of the London Theatres; Charles Lamb's Works; Thomas Dibdin's Reminiscences; Hazlitt's Criticisms and Dramatic Essays on the English Stage.] J. K.

ELLMAN, JOHN (1753–1832), agriculturist, the son of Richard and Elizabeth Ellman, was born at Hartfield, Sussex, 17 Oct. 1753. His father, who was a farmer, removed to Glynde in 1761, and on his death in 1780, Ellman succeeded to his farm, which under his management quickly assumed a position second to none in the county. He turned his attention particularly to improving the breed of Southdown sheep, and by careful selection of animals for breeding purposes obtained such successful results that, in spite of much jealousy and detraction, he fully established the high merits of the Southdown breed, which had before been scarcely recognised. Unlike his rival Robert Bakewell (1725–1795) [q. v.], Ellman was perfectly frank and open about his methods, and was always ready to give advice to any one who cared to ask for it. Consequently, when the success of his breeding became known, his assistance was eagerly sought, and among those who more frequently visited his farm or corresponded with him were the Duke of Bedford, the Earl of Albemarle, Lord Somerville, who introduced him to George III, and Lords Egremont, Sligo, Darnley, Londonderry, Sheffield, and Chichester. In 1786 he founded, together with the Earl of Sheffield, Lewes wool fair, and it was at his suggestion that Lord Egremont formed the Sussex Agricultural Association, for the improvement of cattle and the encouragement of industry and skill among the labouring poor. He also

took a leading part in the institution of the Smithfield Cattle Show, and on the death of Richard Astley was made 'father' of the show, an office he held for many years. He was a frequent prize-winner both in London and Sussex, and won with such ease that he presently refrained from exhibiting or withdrew his sheep while the judging was in progress, so that they might not detract from the appearance of the others. He was also successful with his cattle, and in 1819 the board of agriculture awarded him the gold medal for the best cultivated farm in Sussex. In 1800 a silver cup was presented to him by the landowners of Sussex, and five years later the Duke of Bedford gave him a silver vase as a mark of his personal esteem. To the board of agriculture Ellman rendered considerable service, and several contributions by him will be found in their 'Transactions.' He also largely gave assistance to Arthur Young in compiling his voluminous 'Annals of Agriculture,' contributed frequently to the 'Farmers' Journal,' and corresponded with an agricultural association at Rouen, some of his communications to which were published by the Société d'Amélioration des Laines. He wrote the article 'Sheep' in Baxter's 'Library of Agricultural and Horticultural Knowledge,' and revised other papers in the same work. Outside of agriculture Ellman interested himself largely in county affairs. He was a commissioner of taxes, and as expenditor of Lewes and Laughton levels, he carried out a difficult scheme for the improvement of navigation on the Ouse. The reconstruction of Newhaven harbour was also largely due to his energy. In his own village of Glynde he maintained a school for labourers' children at his own expense, and he refused to allow the licensing of any public-house there. He strongly insisted, however, on the vital importance of beer to farm labourers, and afforded facilities for home brewing. The unmarried labourers in his employ he lodged in his house, and on their marriage was accustomed to provide them with a plot of grass land for a cow and pig, and a certain amount of arable; but he was opposed to any allotment system on a larger scale. In 1829 Ellman retired from active work, and his celebrated flock was sold by auction. The rest of his life he resided alternately at High Cross, Uckfield, a small estate of his own, and in Albion Street, Lewes, where he died on 22 Nov. 1832. He was twice married, first on 27 Jan. 1783 to Elizabeth Spencer, by whom he had one son John, also a very successful farmer; secondly to Constantia Davies, daughter of the vicar of Glynde, who had a numerous family, and survived him. Ellman's portrait was painted by Lonsdaile for presentation to his wife on his retirement from the farm, and has been engraved.

[Memoir of Ellman prefixed to vol. ii. of Baxter's Library of Practical Agriculture, 4th edit. 1851; Lower's Sussex Worthies, p. 84; Young's Annals of Agriculture, passim; the paper 'Gleanings on an Excursion to Lewes Fair' in vol. xvii. contains a description at length of Ellman's improvements in his flock and cattle.] A. V.

ELLWOOD, THOMAS (1639–1713), quaker and friend of Milton, born at Crowell, Oxfordshire, in October 1639, was younger son of Walter Ellwood, by his wife, Elizabeth Potman, 'both well descended but of declining families.' He had two sisters and a brother, all older than himself. From 1642 to 1646 the family lived in London. At seven Thomas went to the free school at Thame and proved himself 'full of spirit' and fond of 'a waggish prank.' He was removed at an early age to save expense, became an expert in all field sports, and afterwards reproached himself with much thoughtless dissipation. But his worst crime seems to have been an endeavour to run a ruffian, who insulted his father, through the body with a rapier. His brother and mother both died in his youth. In the autumn of 1659 a change came over him. He and his father paid a visit to Isaac Pennington, son of Alderman Isaac Pennington, the regicide, who lived at the Grange, Chalfont St. Peters, Buckinghamshire. Pennington's wife, Mary, widow of Sir William Springett, had been intimate with the Ellwoods while they lived in London, and her daughter Gulielma had often been Thomas's playmate in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Young Ellwood and his father found that the Penningtons had lately become quakers—a sect of which little had then been heard. Desirous to learn something of the quaker doctrine, a second visit of some days' duration was paid in December 1659, when Thomas attended a quakers' meeting at a neighbouring farmhouse and made the acquaintance of Edward Burrough [q. v.] and James Nayler [q. v.] Burrough's preaching conquered Ellwood, and after attending a second quakers' meeting at High Wycombe he joined the new sect and adopted their modes of dress and speech. His father strongly resented his son's conversion, thrashed him for wearing his hat in his presence, and kept him a prisoner in his house through the winter of 1660. At Easter the Penningtons managed to remove him to Chalfont St. Peters, where he stayed till Whitsuntide. He attended quakers' meetings with great assiduity, and late in 1660 was divinely inspired, according to his own account, to write

and print an attack on the established clergy entitled 'An Alarm to the Priests.' He afterwards visited London and met George Fox the younger.

About November 1660 Ellwood invited a quaker of Oxford named Thomas Loe to attend a meeting at Crowell. Loe was at the moment in prison in Oxford Castle, and Ellwood's letter fell into the hands of Lord Falkland, lord-lieutenant of the county. A party of horse was sent to arrest him; he was taken before two justices of the peace at Weston, refused to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and was imprisoned for some months at Oxford in the house of the city marshal, a linendraper in High Street named Galloway. His father procured his release and vainly tried to keep him from quakers' meetings for the future. In April 1661 the elder Ellwood and his two daughters left Crowell to live in London; at Michaelmas the son sold by his father's directions all the cattle and dismissed the servants. For a time he lived in complete solitude. He often visited Aylesbury gaol, where many of his quaker friends were in prison. At a quakers' meeting held at Pennington's house he was, for a second time, arrested, but was soon discharged. For no apparent reason he was immediately afterwards arrested as a rogue and vagabond by the watch at Beaconsfield while walking home from Chalfont St. Peters, but was released after one night's detention.

Early in 1662 Ellwood was attacked by smallpox, and on his recovery went to London for purposes of study. His friend Pennington consulted Dr. Paget in the matter, and Paget arranged that he should read with the poet Milton, who 'lived now a private and retired life in [Jewin Street] London, and having wholly lost his sight kept always a man to read to him.' Ellwood obtained lodgings in Aldersgate, near Milton's house, and went 'every day in the afternoon, excepting on the first day of the week, and sitting by [the poet] in his dining-room read to him in such books in the Latin tongue as he pleased to hear me read.' Milton taught Ellwood the foreign mode of pronouncing Latin. After six weeks' application Ellwood fell ill, went to Wycombe to recruit, and returned in October 1662. On the 26th of that month he was arrested at a quakers' meeting held at the Bull and Mouth in Aldersgate, and was confined till December in the old Bridewell in Fleet Street. At first he was so ill supplied with money that he was in danger of starvation, but his father and the Penningtons forwarded him a few pounds, and he made 'night waistcoats of red and yellow flannel' for a hosier of Cheapside. On 19 Dec. he was taken before the recorder at the Old Bailey, declined to take the oath of allegiance, and was committed to Newgate. His plea of illegal detention was overruled. In Newgate he was 'thrust into the common side' to share the society of 'the meanest sort of felons and pickpockets.' The unsanitary condition of the prison caused the death of a quaker, one of Ellwood's many companions. At the inquest the foreman of the jury expressed deep disgust at the prisoners' treatment. Ellwood was consequently removed to the old Bridewell, where he lived under easy discipline till his discharge in January 1662–3.

From that date till 1669 Ellwood resided with the Penningtons as Latin tutor to their young children, and he managed their estates in Kent and Sussex. He consented to the sale of Crowell by his father, and thus acquired a little ready money. In June 1665 he hired a cottage for Milton at Chalfont St. Giles, where the poet lived while the plague raged in London. On 1 July he was arrested while attending a quaker's funeral at Amersham, and spent a month in Aylesbury gaol. On his discharge he paid Milton a visit, and the poet lent him the manuscript of 'Paradise Lost.' Ellwood, when returning the paper, remarked, 'Thou hast said much of "Paradise Lost," but what hast thou to say of "Paradise Found"?' When Ellwood called on Milton in London in the autumn, he was shown the second poem, called 'Paradise Regained,' and Milton added, 'This is owing to you, for you put it into my head by the question you put to me at Chalfont, which before I had not thought of.' Pennington was in prison at Aylesbury for nine months during 1665 and 1666; his household was broken up, and Ellwood stayed with his pupils at Aylesbury, Bristol, and Amersham. From 13 March 1665–6 till 25 June Ellwood was himself imprisoned once again at Wycombe for attending a meeting at Hedgerley, Buckinghamshire. On 28 Oct. 1669 he was married according to quaker rites to a quakeress named Mary Ellis. On her death in 1708 she was stated to be eighty-five years old, and was therefore Ellwood's senior by sixteen years. His father resented the ceremony, and declined to make any provision for his son, contrary to a previous promise. Meanwhile Ellwood actively engaged in controversy both within and without the quaker community, and grew intimate with the quaker leaders, Fox and Penn. The latter married his friend, Gulielma Pennington. In 1668 he lent assistance to George Fox in his attempt to crush John Perrot, leader of a body of dissentient

quakers, who insisted on wearing their hats during worship, and he travelled with Fox through the west of England on an organising expedition. In 1670 he was present at a debate at High Wycombe between Jeremy Ives, a baptist, and William Penn. When the Conventicle Act became law in July 1670, and the quakers were at the mercy of corrupt informers, Ellwood energetically sought to circumvent their tricks, and proceeded against two named Aris and Lacy for perjury. In 1674 he was busily engaged in a controversy with Thomas Hicks, a baptist, who had written against quakerism. Ellwood issued many broadsides charging Hicks with forgery. He also wrote much against tithes from 1678 onwards, and attacked with great bitterness one William Rogers, who in 1682 ignored the authority of Penn and Fox, and denied their right to control the quaker community. Ellwood's account of his own life ceased in July 1683, when he was protesting against the injustice of treating quakers' meetings as riotous assemblies, and had himself just been threatened with prosecution for seditious libel because he had warned the constables to beware of informers. His father died about 1684 at Holton, and Ellwood was charged by his enemies with absenting himself from his funeral. But he behaved dutifully, according to his own account, to the last. He lived in retirement at Amersham for the greater part of his remaining years, writing constantly against internal divisions in the quaker ranks, and denouncing with especial vigour in 1684 the heresy of George Keith. In 1690 he edited the journal of his friend, George Fox, and was long engaged on a history of the Old Testament. In 1707 and 1708 distraints were levied on him for the non-payment of tithes. His wife, 'a solid, weighty woman' (according to Ellwood's biographer), died 5 or 9 April 1708, and he himself died 1 March 1713–14, at his house, Hunger Hill, Amersham. Both were buried in the Friends' burying-place at New Jordan, Chalfont St. Giles.

His numerous works include the following: 1. 'An Alarm to the Priests,' 1660. 2. 'A Fresh Pursuit,' 1674, and 'Forgery no Christianity,' 1674, two tracts attacking Thomas Hicks, the baptist. 3. 'The Foundation of Tithes shaken,' 1678; 2nd edition, 1720. 4. 'An Antidote against the Infection of William Rogers' Book,' 1682. 5. 'A Caution to Constables . . . concerned in the execution of the Conventicle Act,' 1683. 6. 'A Discourse concerning Riots,' 1683. 7. 'A Seasonable Dissuasive from Persecution,' 1683. 8. 'Rogero Mastix,' 1685. 9. 'An Epistle to Friends,' 1686. 10. 'The Account from Wickham,' 1689. 11. 'Thomas Ellwood's Answer to . . . Leonard Key,' 1693? 12. 'Deceit Discovered,' 1693. 13. 'A Fair Examination of a Foul Paper,' 1693, deals with the heresies of Rogers, John Raunce, and Leonard Key, who issued scandalous statements about Ellwood. 14. 'A Reply to an Answer lately published to [William Penn's] "Brief Examination and State of Liberty,"' 1691. 15. 'An Epistle to Friends . . . warning them of George Keith,' 1694. 16. 'A Further Discovery of that Spirit of Contention . . . in George Keith,' 1694. 17. 'Truth Defended,' 1695. 18. 'An Answer to George Keith's Narrative,' 1696, deals with George Keith's dissenting views. 19. 'A sober Reply on behalf of the People called Quakers to two petitions against them,' 1699 and 1700. 20. 'The Glorious Brightness of the Gospel Day,' 1707. 21. 'Sacred History, or the Historical Part of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament,' 1705, fol. 22. 'Sacred History, or the Historical Part of the New Testament,' 1709. Both these works were reprinted together in 1720, 1778, 1794, and (New York) 1834. 23. 'Davideis: a Sacred Poem in Five Books,' 1712, 1722, 1727, 1749, 1763, 1796, begun before 1688, and before the author had read Cowley's 'Davideis.' 24. 'A Collection of Poems on various subjects,' n.d. 25. 'The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood . . . written by his own hand,' first published in 1714, with a supplement by J[oseph] W[yeth], continuing the work from 1683, where the autobiography stops abruptly, till the date of Ellwood's death in 1713–14. A number of testimonies are prefixed: 'An Answer to some Objections of a Moderate Enquirer,' i.e. Robert Snow, and an 'Account of Tythes in General,' appear towards the close. Ten other pieces are enumerated at the end of the volume, in a list of manuscripts 'left behind him.' The autobiography, which includes many hymns and religious verses, has been reprinted many times (2nd edition, 1714; 3rd edition, 1765; 4th edition, 1791; 5th edition, 1825; 6th edition, 1855). The first American edition appeared in Philadelphia in 1775. Professor Henry Morley included it in his 'Universal Library,' 1885. Testimonies by Ellwood concerning Isaac Pennington (1681), George Fox (1694), and Oliver Sansom (1710), are published in the respective lives. An interesting volume in Ellwood's handwriting, belonging to Anna Huntley of High Wycombe, includes an elegy on Milton.

[Ellwood's Autobiography described above; Smith's Friends' Books; Masson's Life of Milton; Bickley's George Fox (1884); Maria Webb's Penns and Penningtons, 1867.] S. L. L.

ELLYS, ANTHONY (1690–1761), bishop of St. David's, born at Yarmouth in Norfolk, was baptised on 8 June 1690. His father and grandfather were respectable merchants in that town, and in their turn mayors of the borough. He was educated at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1712, M.A. in 1716, and D.D. in 1728, on the occasion of a royal visit to that university. He became a fellow of his college and took holy orders. In 1719, his father then being mayor, the Yarmouth corporation appointed him minister of St. George's Chapel in his native town. On account of his excellent chances of other promotion the customary salary was doubled. But in a year he found more lucrative openings. He became in 1721 a chaplain to Lord-chancellor Macclesfield, in 1724 vicar of St. Olave's, Jewry, and canon of Gloucester, and in 1729 vicar of Great Marlow also, without surrendering any of his earlier preferments. In 1736 he published 'A Plea for the Sacramental Test as best Security for the Church established, and very conducive to the Welfare of the State.' In 1752 he published anonymously some 'Remarks on Mr. Hume's Essay concerning Miracles,' which, though 'written in a sensible and genteel manner,' 'did not excite the attention they deserved.' In October 1752 he was appointed bishop of St. David's, and consecrated on 28 Jan. in the following year (Stubbs, *Reg. Sacrum Angl.* p. 117). His appointment was by some attributed to the reputation which he had gained as being engaged on a great work in defence of the protestant reformation. Some objected to the nomination of an upholder of the Test Act as 'detrimental to liberty.' But Archbishop Herring, to whose advice Ellys's preferment was due, replied that the 'stick had been bent rather too far on the side of liberty,' and that it was time to 'give it now a bent to the contrary side.' Moreover, George II had urged the archbishop not to allow the 'evening of his days' to be 'disquieted by church affairs,' and Herring 'did his best to make things easy.' Yet Ellys was a 'moderate whig,' though his whiggism is described as tempered by 'a zealous attachment to our ecclesiastical establishment.' Ellys continued to hold his canonry and his city living *in commendam*, and he is praised for the regularity with which he went 'every Sunday morning in the winter season' from his house in Queen Square to preach to his parishioners. He gave so little countenance to the scheme of John Jones of Welwyn for establishing a seminary for clerical education in his diocese that the books offered by Jones to the bishop were transferred to the presbyterian academy at Carmarthen (Nichols, *Lit. Anecd.* i. 625, 631). But the 'Defence of the Reformation' never appeared from the press, and this want of energy or confidence seems to have disgusted the bishop's friends and patrons. He published nothing more in his lifetime but a few sermons, preached on special occasions before the lords, the commons, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. He died at Gloucester on 16 Jan. 1761, and was buried in the south aisle of that cathedral. His age is erroneously described on his monument as sixty-eight. He married Anne, eldest daughter of Sir Stephen Anderson of Eyworth, Bedfordshire, and left one daughter, who married unhappily and became insane. Dr. Dodd wrote some verses on his death, and a manuscript volume of poems by his widow, mostly on the same subject, is still extant. After his death his friends published his 'Tracts on the Liberty spiritual and temporal of the Protestants of England,' which was either a fragment or the whole of the long-expected great work. The first part, which appeared in 1763, was for the greater part a polemic against popery, though his plea for the test was also reprinted in it. The second part, issued in 1765, was a treatise on constitutional liberty, which shows a certain amount of historical knowledge and great zeal for the revolution settlement.

[Nichols's Literary Anecdotes, i. 625, 631, ii. 414, 454, 720, 725, iv. 481; Biographia Britannica (Kippis); Notes and Queries, 1st ser. v. 386; Monthly Review, xxix. 117–34; Gent. Mag. (1796), lxvi. 737, 1012; Lipscomb's Buckinghamshire, iii. 601; Graduati Cantab.; Brit. Mus. Cat. of Printed Books.] T. F. T.

ELLYS or ELLIS, JOHN (1701–1757), portrait-painter, born in March 1700–1, was, when about fifteen years old, placed for instruction under Sir James Thornhill, with whom he did not stay long, and for a short time under Johann Rudolph Schmutz. He subsequently became an imitator of John Vanderbank, and was a student with Hogarth and others in the academy started in October 1720 by Cheron and Vanderbank in St. Martin's Lane. After a few years Ellys and Hogarth succeeded to the directorship of this academy, and maintained their connection with it for about thirty years. When young Ellys obtained a special warrant to copy any pictures at the royal palaces for study, and copied several pictures by Vandyck, Kneller, Lely, and others. He was a zealous adherent of the Kneller school of portrait-painting, and resented the departure from it inaugurated by Sir Joshua Reynolds. He eventually succeeded to Vanderbank's house and practice, and having already purchased from Moses

Vanderbank a share of the place of tapestry-maker to the crown, eventually obtained that position also. Ellys was consulted and employed by Sir Robert Walpole in the formation of his celebrated collection of pictures, and among other similar charges was especially sent over to Holland to purchase from the Princess of Friesland the great picture of 'The Virgin and Angels' by Vandyck, now in the Hermitage Gallery at St. Petersburg with the rest of the Houghton collection. For these services Ellys was rewarded by Walpole with the sinecure of master keeper of the lions in the Tower, which he held up to his death. He had, in October 1736, succeeded Philip Mercier as principal painter to Frederick, prince of Wales. He was a member of the committee of artists appointed in 1755 to frame a plan for constructing a royal academy, but did not survive to see any result of their efforts, as he died on 14 Sept. 1757. Ellys, who was usually known as 'Jack Ellys,' was a good and careful portrait-painter of the rather uninteresting school to which he belonged. There is a good portrait group of Lord Whitworth and his nephew, dated 1727, by him at Knole in Kent. Many of his portraits were engraved by John Faber, jun. Among these were Lavinia Fenton, duchess of Bolton, James Figg, the famous pugilist, Frederick, prince of Wales, Henry Medley, George Oldham, Lord Mayor Humphrey Parsons, William Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Walker, the actor, as Captain Macheath, Robert Wilks, the actor, and George Stanhope, dean of Canterbury. The last named was also engraved by J. Sympson. Among engravings by other artists from Ellys's portraits were Kitty Clive, by J. Tinney; Sir Charles Wager, by G. White; and Edmund Gibson, bishop of London, by G. Vertue.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Vertue MSS. (Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 23068 &c.); Gent. Mag. 1757, xxvii. 436; Chaloner Smith's British Mezzotinto Portraits.] L. C.

ELLYS, Sir RICHARD (1688?–1742), theological writer, was eldest son of Sir William Ellys of Wyham and grandson of the first baronet, Sir Thomas (created 1660). His mother was Isabella, daughter of Richard Hampden, chancellor of the exchequer, and granddaughter of John Hampden. Ellys, who was born about 1688, was educated abroad, probably in Holland. His tutor regarded him as the equal in Greek scholarship of almost any professor, and he was also acquainted with Hebrew. Throughout his life he corresponded with continental scholars, by whom he was much esteemed (see Gronovius's dedication to Ellys of his edition of Ælian's 'Varia Historia,' and the Wetsteins' edition of Suicer's 'Thesaurus,' to which he had contributed the use of a manuscript of Suicer in his possession). He was especially intimate with Maittaire, who, in his 'Senilia,' addressed several pieces of Latin verse to him. His learning took the direction of biblical criticism and bore fruit in his 'Fortuita Sacra; quibus subiicitur Commentarius de Cymbalis' (Rotterdam, 1727), the first part of which consists of a critical commentary in Latin on doubtful passages in the Greek Testament, and the second of a curious treatise on cymbals, also in Latin. In 1727 Ellys was elected for the third and last time member of parliament for Boston, Lincolnshire, having been previously returned at a bye-election in 1719 and in 1722, and in the same year he succeeded his father (*d.* 6 Oct.) in the title and his estate of Nocton, Lincolnshire. (It is stated in Collins's *Baronetage*, vol. iii. pt. i. p. 89, apparently on the authority of Ellys himself, that he twice represented Grantham in parliament, but it does not so appear from the official 'Returns,' though Sir William Ellys represented that borough from 1715 to 1724.) Ellys now devoted himself to antiquarian research and amassed at Nocton a fine library. On 24 June 1742 an account of this library and some curiosities lately added thereto formed the day's transactions of the Gentlemen's Society at Spalding, of which Ellys had been elected a member on 12 March 1729. Ellys held strong religious opinions. He had been an Arminian, but was a decided Calvinist in 1730, and when living in London (Bolton Street, Piccadilly) he was a member of Calamy's congregation, and after Calamy's death of Bradbury's. He steadfastly befriended Thomas Boston [q. v.], whose treatise on Hebrew accents, 'Tractatus Stigmato-logicus,' was dedicated to him. He maintained his family's traditional hospitality. His father had kept open house at Nocton for all comers, and every day twelve dishes were prepared whether or no any guests came to partake of them. Ellys allowed 800*l.* per annum to a steward for the maintenance of the same custom. Ellys was twice married: first to Elizabeth, daughter and coheiress of Sir Edwin Hussey, bart.; and, secondly, to Susan, daughter and coheiress of Thomas Gould, who outlived him, and, re-marrying with Sir Francis Dashwood, died Lady Despencer on 19 Jan. 1769. By neither wife, however, did he have issue, and the disposition of his property excited much interest. Sir Charles Hanbury Williams, in his satire, 'Peter and my Lord

Quidam,' says that the chief competitors for his inheritance were 'Horace,' that is Horatio Walpole, who wrote a Latin ode in Ellys's honour and gave him his portrait, and Hampden, that is Richard Hampden, who had married Ellys's sister. On the death of Ellys (21 Feb. 1742) it was found that his estates were entailed on his second wife, and after her death or marriage on the families of Hobart and Trevor, into whose possession they ultimately passed. His cousin, William Strode of Barnington, Somersetshire, was heir-at-law and contested the will in the court of chancery, but without effect. Ellys's splendid library was removed from Nocton to Blickling, Norfolk, then a seat of the Hobarts and now the property of the Marquis of Lothian.

[Notes and Queries, 3rd ser. vi. 183 (contributed by Professor J. E. B. Mayor), x. 128, 156; Gent. Mag. 1812, pt. ii. p. 447, 1813, pt. i. p. 29; Bogue and Bennet's Hist. of Dissenters, iv. 6; Collins's Baronetage, as above; Burke's Extinct Baronetage, p. 181; Chalmers's Biog. Dict. sub voc.; Memoirs of Life of Thomas Boston, by himself, pp. 46, 487 (the appendix contains several letters passing between Ellys and Boston); Nichols's Lit. Anecd. vi. 13, 138.] A. V.

ELMER. [See ETHELMAER.]

ELMER, JOHN. [See AYLMER, JOHN, (1521–1594), bishop of London.]

ELMER, STEPHEN (*d.* 1796), painter, resided at Farnham in Surrey, where he was a maltster. He turned his hand to painting, and developed a special power in depicting still life and dead game, and was perhaps the most successful painter in this line that England has produced. He was a member of the Free Society of Artists in 1763, and exhibited numerous pictures up to 1772, when he first began to exhibit at the Royal Academy, of which he was elected an associate in that year. From that time to 1795, the year before his death, he contributed a great number of pictures, which were very popular, and were painted in a bold, free manner, and with great truth to nature. He did not confine himself entirely to still life, but occasionally painted genre pictures, such as 'The Miser' (engraved by B. Granger), 'The Politician' (engraved by T. Ryder), scripture pieces, such as 'The Last Supper,' formerly over the altar, but now in the vestry of Farnham Church, and portraits. Some of his still-life pictures were engraved by J. Scott, J. F. Miller, C. Turner, and others. Elmer died and was buried at Farnham in 1796. He does not appear to have been married, but left his property, including a large collection of his own paintings, to his nephew. The latter were collected, and exhibited at the great room in the Haymarket in the spring of 1799, under the title of 'Elmer's Sportsman's Exhibition.' Some of these were disposed of for good prices, and the remainder were removed to Gerrard Street, Soho, where they were accidentally destroyed by fire on 6 Feb. 1801.

WILLIAM ELMER, usually called the son of the above, but more probably his nephew, was a painter of the same class of subject. He practised in Ireland, and occasionally exhibited at the Royal Academy between 1783 and 1799. There is a small mezzotint portrait of him as a schoolboy, dated 26 June 1772, and engraved by Butler Clowes [q. v.]

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Edwards's Anecdotes of Painting; Sandby's Hist. of the Royal Academy; Royal Academy Catalogues; information from the Rev. Canon Philip Hoste.] L. C.

ELMES, HARVEY LONSDALE (1813–1847), architect, was the son and pupil of James Elmes [q. v.] In 1836 a competition was advertised for designs for the erection of St. George's Hall in Liverpool. Elmes, though quite young, was advised by his friend, B. R. Haydon, to compete, and was successful among eighty-five other candidates. This success was followed up by the acceptance of his designs for the assize courts and the Collegiate Institution in the same town, and the county lunatic asylum at West Derby. St. George's Hall was commenced in 1838, and in 1846 the prince consort, on his visit to Liverpool, was so pleased with it that he presented Elmes with a gold medal. Elmes died of consumption in Jamaica on 26 Nov. 1847, aged 34, leaving a widow and child. A subscription of 1,400*l.* was raised for them. The completion of St. George's Hall was entrusted to C. R. Cockerell, R.A. [q. v.], who expressed his admiration of the work. Elmes exhibited some of his architectural drawings at the Royal Academy.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Builder, 3 Jan. and 5 Feb. 1848.] L. C.

ELMES, JAMES (1782–1862), architect and antiquary, son of Samuel Elmes, was born in London 15 Oct. 1782, admitted into Merchant Taylors' School in April 1796, and subsequently became a pupil of George Gibson, and a student of the Royal Academy, where he gained the silver medal for an architectural design in 1804. Between 1808 and 1814 he exhibited designs at the Royal Academy, was vice-president of the Royal Architectural Society in 1809, and surveyor of the port of London—posts which loss of

sight compelled him to relinquish in 1848. He designed and erected a good many buildings in the metropolis, but devoted most of his attention to the literature of art. He was a frequent contributor to architectural and antiquarian periodicals, and from 1816 to 1820 was editor of 'The Annals of the Fine Arts,' the first periodical work of its kind. In this Elmes was the constant champion of his friend B. R. Haydon [q. v.], and of the Elgin marbles. Many of Haydon's papers were printed by Elmes, who through Haydon made the acquaintance of Keats; the latter's odes 'To the Nightingale' and 'On a Grecian Urn,' and also his sonnets 'To Haydon' and 'On seeing the Elgin Marbles,' first appeared in the 'Annals;' also Wordsworth's sonnets 'Upon the Sight of a Beautiful Picture' and 'To B. R. Haydon, Esq.' Late in life Elmes employed his pen upon theological topics, writing upon the 'Hebrew Poetry of the Middle Ages,' and compiling a 'Harmony of the Gospels.' He died at Greenwich 2 April 1862, and was buried at Charlton, having outlived his son, Harvey Lonsdale Elmes [q. v.], an architect of great promise, many years.

Elmes's chief works are: 1. 'Hints on the Improvement of Prisons,' 1817, 4to; a popular treatise on dilapidations (3rd ed. 1829). 2. 'Lectures on Architecture,' 1823, 8vo. 3. 'Memoirs of the Life and Works of Sir Christopher Wren,' 1823, 4to (enlarged ed. 8vo, 1852). 4. 'The Arts and Artists,' 3 vols. 12mo, 1825. 5. 'A Bibliographical Dictionary of the Fine Arts,' 8vo, 1826. Also 'Elmes's Quarterly Review' and 'Thomas Clarkson, a Monograph.' His latest work was 'The Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ rendered into one narrative,' 1856, 12mo.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists, 137; Gent. Mag. 3rd ser. xii. 784; The Builder, 19 April 1862; Robinson's Reg. of Merchant Taylors' School; Brit. Mus. Cat.] C. J. R.

ELMHAM, THOMAS (*d.* 1440?), historian, Benedictine monk of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, was probably a native of North Elmham in Norfolk. He was treasurer of his society in 1407, in which year he was arrested at the suit of one Henry Somerset for excessive zeal in the discharge of his duties. His action seems, however, to have been subsequently affirmed. Before many years he had joined the Cluniac order, and was prior of Lenton in Nottinghamshire by 11 June 1414. In 1416 he was appointed vicar-general for England and Scotland, and ten years later commissary-general for all vacant benefices belonging to the Cluniac order in England, Scotland, and Ireland. In the latter year he resigned his office at Lenton, a certain John Elmham receiving it in his stead. Mr. Hardwick surmises that he was still living in 1440, on the evidence of a copy of verses in which he addresses 'the glorious Doctor Master John Somersette.' According to the same editor, though Somerset was a Cambridge fellow by 1410, his reputation was not sufficiently established to warrant the use of such phraseology till about 1440.

The works ascribed to Thomas Elmham are: 1. 'Historia Monasterii Sancti Augustini Cantuariensis,' extending from the coming of St. Augustine to England down to A.D. 806, from which point, after skipping over more than 280 years, it recommences in 1087, and gives a series of charters extending to 1191. The main importance of this work (exclusive of its charters) is that it is based on the earlier chronicle, now lost, of Thomas Sprott. 2. A prose life of Henry V. 3. 'Liber Metricus de Henrico V^to^,' which seems to be intended as a supplement to the previous book. The verses which serve as a proœmium to the 'Liber Metricus' form an acrostic 'Thomas Elmham Monachus,' and the concluding verses also spell the writer's name with the additional letters N. L. The 'History of St. Augustine's' contains no mention of the author's name. Internal evidence, however, shows that he was a monk of the monastery in question; that he was connected with the East-Anglian counties, and probably with North Elmham itself; that he was writing probably not long after the revolt of Owen Glendower, and certainly after the death of Archbishop Arundel (20 Feb. 1414). As the chronological table prefixed to the work ends in 1418, while the last three or four years are entered in a different hand, Mr. Hardwick concludes that he probably ended his work in 1414, the very year when we know from other sources that Elmham became prior of Lenton. Other arguments in favour of both works being written by the same Thomas Elmham may be drawn from the style and also from the fact that certain verses in the final acrostic of the 'Liber Metricus' appear, in a very slightly altered form, in the 'Historia Monasterii.' Thomas Elmham's works have been edited, the 'Historia' by Hardwick (Rolls Series, 1858), 'Vita et Gesta Henrici V' by Hearne (1727), and the 'Liber Metricus' by C. A. Cole (Rolls Series, 1858).

[See the prefaces to the editions alluded to above.] T. A. A.

ELMORE, ALFRED (1815–1881), painter, was born at Clonakilty, co. Cork, in 1815. From his childhood he gave promise of distinction in art, and at the age

of nineteen he exhibited his first picture at the Royal Academy. At the exhibition of the British Institution in 1838 his 'Crucifixion' occupied a prominent place, and in the succeeding year he made a second appearance at the Academy with 'The Martyrdom of Becket.' Both these pictures are now in one of the catholic churches in Dublin, the 'Becket' being a bequest to the church by Mr. O'Donnell, for whom it was painted. 'Rienzi in the Forum,' produced in 1844, and several Italian pictures exhibited at the British Institution, were the result of a visit paid by the artist to Italy. Elmore's Italian experiences and study accentuated his feeling for semi-historical subjects, and his representation of the 'Origin of the Guelph and Ghibelline Quarrel,' exhibited in 1845, established his reputation as an historical painter. The work was sold for 300*l.*, and it also gained him his entrance as an associate into the Royal Academy. Among the later important works by this artist were: 'The Fainting of Hero,' from 'Much Ado about Nothing,' executed in 1846; 'The Invention of the Stocking Loom,' a picture which achieved great popularity, 1847; 'The Deathbed of Robert, King of Naples, the Wise and Good,' 1848; 'Religious Controversy in the Time of Louis XIV,' 1849; 'Griselda,' 1850; and 'Hotspur and the Fop,' 1851. Elmore was adequately represented at the International Exhibitions of London 1851 and 1862, and at the Paris Exhibitions of 1855 and 1878. Among the more popular of the works thus exhibited were 'Mary Queen of Scots,' 'After the Fall,' and 'Lucretia Borgia.' Elmore was elected an academician in 1877. He died in London, 24 Jan. 1881.

[Ann. Reg. 1881; Men of the Time, 10th edit.] G. B. S.

ELMSLEY or **ELMSLY, PETER** (1736–1802), bookseller, was born in Aberdeenshire in 1736, and succeeded Paul Vaillant (1716–1802), whose family had carried on a foreign bookselling business in the Strand, opposite Southampton Street, since 1686. He, with Cadell, Dodsley, and others, formed the literary club of booksellers who produced many important works, including Johnson's 'Lives of the Poets.' Gibbon writes to Lord Sheffield, 2 Oct. 1793: 'My first evening was passed at home in a very agreeable *tête-à-tête* with my friend Elmsley,' and the following month he speaks of lodging in a 'house of Elmsley's' in St. James's Street (*Memoirs*, 1814, pp. 408, 411). Elmsly was intimate with Wilkes, and directed the sale of his library. Miss Wilkes ordered that 'all her manuscripts, of whatever kind, . . . be faithfully delivered to Mr. Elmsly,' but he died before her (*Gent. Mag.* lxxii. pt. i. 467). To the usual Scottish schooling Elmsly added a large fund of information acquired by his own exertions in after life. He knew French well. His business career was honourable and prosperous, and many of the leading book collectors and literary men of the day were on friendly terms with him. A short time before his death he gave up his business to a shopman, David Bremner, who soon died, and was succeeded by Messrs. James Payne & J. Mackinlay, the one the youngest son of Thomas Payne of the Mews-gate, the other one of Elmsly's assistants.

Elmsley died at Brighton, 3 May 1802, in his sixty-seventh year. His remains were conveyed to his house in Sloane Street, London, and were buried at Marylebone 10 May. He left a widow. A handsome share of his large fortune fell to his nephew, the Rev. Peter Elmsley, D.D. (1773–1825) [q. v.]

[Gent. Mag. lxxii. pt. i. 477, xcv. pt. i. 375; Nichols's Lit. Anecd. iii. 310, v. 325, vi. 441, viii. 558–9, ix. 478–9; Timperley's Encyclopædia, 1842, pp. 746, 811.] H. R. T.

ELMSLEY, PETER (1773–1825), classical scholar, born in 1773, was educated at Hampstead, at Westminster, and at Christ Church College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. 1794, M.A. 1797, B.D. 30 Oct. 1823, D.D. 7 Nov. 1823. He left the university without a fellowship, but with a reputation for great learning. He took orders and was presented in 1798 to Little Horkesley in Essex, which he held till his death. He inherited a fortune from his uncle, Peter Elmsley [q.v.], the bookseller. About 1802 he lived in Edinburgh, and was intimate with the founders of the 'Edinburgh Review,' to which he contributed the articles on Heyne's 'Homer,' Schweighaeuser's 'Athenæus,' Blomfield's 'Prometheus,' and Porson's 'Hecuba.' He was also a contributor to the 'Quarterly Review.' From 1807 till 1816 he lived at St. Mary Cray. Mrs. Grote, in the life of her husband, George Grote, the historian, says that Elmsley was in love with her, and by a false assertion that she was engaged to some one nearly prevented the marriage with Grote. After 1816 he resided chiefly at Oxford. He visited France and Italy several times to collate manuscripts of the classics, and spent the winter of 1818 in the Laurentian Library at Florence. In 1819 he was engaged with Sir Humphry Davy in superintending the development of the papyri from Herculaneum. In 1823 he was appointed principal of St. Alban Hall, Oxford, and Camden professor of ancient history in the

university. He held both appointments till his death, which took place, from heart disease, at Alban Hall on 8 March 1825. Elmsley is best known for his critical labours on Sophocles and Euripides. Editors who have worked in the same field have praised his judicious and painstaking method and his diligence in bringing together authorities for purposes of illustration. He published: 1. Aristophanes, 'Acharnians,' 1809, 8vo. 2. Euripides, 'Omnia Opera,' 1821, 8vo; also various plays of Euripides, separately, between 1806 and 1822. 3. Sophocles, 'Œdipus Tyrannus,' 1809, 12mo; also 1811, 8vo, and 1821, 8vo. 4. Sophocles, 'Œdipus Coloneus,' 1823, 8vo. (Compare also 'Elmsleiana Critica,' Cambr. 1833, 8vo, and 'Scholia' on Sophocles, ed. Gaisford, Oxford, 1825, 8vo.)

[Gent. Mag. 1825, vol. xcv. pt. i. pp. 284, 374–7; Cat. Oxf. Grad.; Brit. Mus. Cat.] W. W.

ELPHEGE (954–1012), archbishop of Canterbury. [See ÆLFHEAH.]

ELPHINSTON, JAMES (1721–1809), educationalist, the son of the Rev. William Elphinston, an episcopalian clergyman of Edinburgh, was born on 6 Dec. 1721. He was educated at the high school and university of Edinburgh, and in his seventeenth year became tutor to Lord Blantyre, and later to Lord Dalhousie. On coming of age he accompanied Thomas Carte [q.v.], the historian, on a tour through Holland, and made a stay at Paris long enough to become proficient in the French language. Returning to Edinburgh he became private tutor to the son of Mr. Murray of Abercairney. In 1750, on the appearance of the 'Rambler,' he superintended an edition which was published in Edinburgh, affixing English translations of the mottoes. This work earned him the thanks of Johnson, who became his occasional correspondent. In 1751 he married a Miss Gordon, niece of General Gordon of Auchintoul, Banffshire, and two years later removed to London and established a school at Brompton, where he 'educated young gentlemen under sixteen at 25*l.* a year, and above that age in proportion.' In 1753 he published 'An Analysis of the French and English Languages' (2 vols. 12mo) and 'Religion,' a poetical translation from the French of the younger Racine, which he followed up four years afterwards with an indifferent rendering of Fénelon's 'Fables.' In 1763, having removed his school to Kensington to a site recently occupied by Baron Grant's mansion, he published 'Education, a Poem, in Four Books,' a composition devoid of merit, and apparently designed as an advertisement of his academy. For the use of his pupils he brought out 'The Principles of English Grammar Digested, or English Grammar reduced to Analogy' (2 vols. 8vo, 1765), a diffuse work, lacking in system, but a second edition was called for in 1766. He gave up school in 1776. It was probably not successful. Dr. A. Carlyle writes of a friend (*Autobiogr.* p. 493): 'He had overcome many disadvantages of his education, for he had been sent to a Jacobite seminary of one Elphinston at Kensington, where his mind was starved, and his body also.' Johnson, however, who dined with Elphinston at his school more than once, remarked more favourably: 'I would not put a boy to him whom I intended for a man of learning; but for the sons of citizens who are to learn a little, get good morals, and then go to trade, he may do very well' (Boswell, ed. Hill, ii. 171). In 1778 Elphinston, who, after a lecturing tour in Edinburgh and Glasgow, had settled in Edward Street, Cavendish Square, published 'An Universal History,' translated from the French of Bossuet, and in the same year appeared a 'Specimen of the Translations of Epigrams of Martial,' in a preface to which he informed the public that he was only waiting for subscriptions to be taken up before he published a complete translation of Martial. It was four years later before the whole work, a handsome quarto, made its appearance, and was received with ridicule. Garrick declared it the most extraordinary of all translations ever attempted, and told Johnson, who had lacked the courage to do the like, that he had advised Elphinston not to publish it. Elphinston's brother-in-law, Strahan the printer, sent him a subscription of 50*l.*, and offered to double the amount if he would refrain from publishing (*ib.* iii. 258). Beattie spoke of the book as 'a whole quarto of nonsense and gibberish;' and Burns addressed the author in the following epigram (Letter to Clarinda, 21 Jan. 1788):—

> O thou whom poesy abhors,
> Whom prose has turned out of doors!
> Heardst thou that groan? proceed no further;
> 'Twas laurell'd Martial roaring murther.

Elphinston retaliated on the critics, who had uniformly and with justice laughed at all his publications, with 'The Hypercritic' (1783), in which he endeavoured to show their malice. He refrained, however, from any further strictly literary ventures, and devoted himself for the remainder of his life to evolving a fantastic system of quasiphonetic spelling He endeavoured to set forth his views on this subject in 'Propriety ascertained in her Picture, or Inglish Speech and Spelling under mutual guides' (2 vols. 4to, n.d. but 1787)

and in 'Inglish Orthoggraphy epittomized, and Propriety's Pocket Diccionary' (8vo, 1790). The spelling adopted in these works is purely arbitrary; 'the,' for example, appears as 'dhe,' 'whole' as 'hoal,' 'which' as 'hwich,' 'single' as 'singuel,' 'portion' as 'poartion,' and 'occasion' as 'occazzion.' In 1791 there further appeared 'Forty years' Correspondence between Geniusses ov boath Sexes and James Elphinston, in 6 pocket volumes, foar ov oridginal letters, two ov poetry,' in which all the letters of himself and his friends appeared with the spelling altered in accordance with the new system. Two further volumes of correspondence appeared in 1794. Elphinston died at Hammersmith on 8 Oct. 1809. His first wife having died in 1778, he re-married, 6 Oct. 1785, Mary Clementina Charlotte Falconer, a niece of the bishop of that name, by whom he had a son. Johnson said of him: 'He has a great deal of good about him, but he is also very defective in some respects; his inner part is good, but his outward part is mighty awkward' (Boswell, ii. 171). Of his eccentric manner Dallas, his biographer in the 'Gentleman's Magazine,' gives the following instance: 'When any ladies were in company whose sleeves were at a distance from their elbows, or whose bosoms were at all exposed, he would fidget from place to place, look askance with a slight convulsion of his left eye, and never rest till he approached some of them, and, pointing to their arms, say, "Oh, yes, indeed! it is very pretty, but it betrays more fashion than modesty!" or some similar phrase; after which he became very good humoured.' Elphinston was also probably the 'old acquaintance' of whom Johnson said: 'He is fit for a travelling governor. He knows French very well. He is a man of good principles, and there should be no danger that a young gentleman should catch his manner, for it is so very bad that it must be avoided;' and of whom he remarked on another occasion: 'He has the most inverted understanding of any man whom I have ever known.' Besides the works mentioned above, Elphinston published 'A Collection of Poems from the best Authors,' 1764; 'Animadversions upon [Lord Kames's] Elements of Criticism,' 1771; and 'Verses, English, French, and Latin, presented to the King of Denmark,' 1768; and Bossuet's 'Universal History,' 1778.

[Anderson's Scottish Nation, ii. 139; Boswell's Life of S. Johnson, ed. Hill, as above, and i. 210, ii. 226, iii. 364; Elphinston's Works and Correspondence; Gent. Mag. 1809, pt. ii., containing life and specimens of his letters; Nichols's Literary Illustrations, vii. 657.] A. V.

ELPHINSTON, JOHN (1722–1785), captain in the royal navy, rear-admiral in the Russian service, on passing his examination for the rank of lieutenant, on 11 July 1745, was certified to have 'been to sea upwards of six years, part whereof in merchants' service to the Mediterranean.' He was promoted to be lieutenant 23 Aug. 1746; and in May 1757 to be commander of the Salamander fireship, in which, in the summer of 1758, he served under Commodore Howe in the expeditions against St. Malo, Cherbourg, and St. Cas; in which last unfortunate affair, while assisting at the re-embarking of the troops, he was taken prisoner. On being exchanged he was advanced to post rank, and appointed to command the Eurus of 20 guns 1 Feb. 1759, in which he accompanied the fleet under Sir Charles Saunders to North America, and was present during the operations which resulted in the capture of Quebec. In April 1760 he was transferred to the Richmond of 32 guns, in which, towards the close of the year, he returned to England, and in February 1761 drove ashore near the Hague and destroyed the Félicité, a French frigate of 32 guns, but apparently in private service. In the beginning of 1762 the Richmond carried out orders to Rear-admiral Rodney in the West Indies, warning him of the contemplated expedition against Havana (Beatson, ii. 532), and directing him to make his arrangements accordingly. The fleet under Sir George Pocock assembled at Martinique and sailed thence on 6 May. On the 26th it was off the east end of Cuba, when Sir George determined on taking the northern route through the Old Straits of Bahama, which, though hazardous and difficult navigation, is much shorter than that by the south coast. 'Luckily,' he wrote, 'the next day the Richmond joined us. She had been down the Old Straits to Cayo-Sal, and Captain Elphinston had been very diligent and careful in his remarks going through and returning back, having taken sketches of the land and Cayos on both sides. He kept ahead of the fleet, and led us through very well' (*ib.* 540). During the siege of Havana Elphinston was actively employed as superintendent of the transport service; and after the capitulation was appointed to the Infante of 70 guns, one of the prizes, which he commanded till the conclusion of peace (*ib.* iii. 432). He afterwards commanded the Firm of 60 guns as a guardship at Plymouth for three years (1764–7), and in 1769 accepted a commission as rear-admiral in the Russian navy. In that capacity he sailed from Cronstadt for the Mediterranean, in the latter end of the year, in command of a squadron of

four ships of the line, with some frigates and smaller vessels; and being detained at Copenhagen by the insubordinate conduct of his officers, left that place only just in time to avoid being caught in the ice. The ships, being but badly found, suffered much damage in the stormy weather of the North Sea, and were obliged to refit at Portsmouth, permission to do so being readily given. They remained at Portsmouth till the middle of April 1770, during which time Elphinston's pretension to fire morning and evening guns in Portsmouth harbour and at Spithead led him into a correspondence with Vice-admiral Geary, who, as commander-in-chief at Portsmouth, refused to allow foreign ships of war to set the watch in that manner. Geary referred the matter to the admiralty, who wrote to the Russian minister that the practice could not be allowed, and that 'if Admiral Elphinston persisted in it, orders must necessarily be immediately given for him to quit the port' (Charnock, v. 184). Instructions were accordingly sent to Elphinston to desist. Towards the end of May the squadron was off the island of Cerigo, and having intelligence that the Turkish fleet had gone to Nauplia, Elphinston determined at once to proceed thither in quest of it. He met it in the mouth of the Gulf on the 27th, and although in numbers it was much superior to his own squadron, he at once attacked, and, after a sharp though partial engagement, put it to flight, the advantage being obtained by means of shell, then for the first time used in a purely naval battle, and which struck terror into the Turks. They drew back to Nauplia, pursued by Elphinston, who again engaged them at anchor on the afternoon of the 28th, but without being able to achieve a decisive result. He accordingly blockaded the enemy at Nauplia, and sent an express to Count Orloff, the commander-in-chief, at Navarino, requesting reinforcements. He afterwards joined Orloff, and on 7 July the fleet, numbering nine sail of the line, found the Turks at anchor outside Chesme Bay. They had fourteen ships of the line, several frigates, and a vast number of transport and store ships, making a grand total of something like two hundred. The wind was blowing fresh on shore, and Elphinston, going on board the admiral, offered to lead in, and proposed that they should anchor with springs on their cables, on the bow and quarter of the weathermost Turkish ships. 'By this arrangement our nine line-of-battle ships would have been engaged against only five or six of the enemy, and the rest of their numerous fleet would have been rendered useless, as they could neither come to the assistance of those ships engaged, nor attempt to get out of the situation they were in without the greatest danger of running on shore' (*Authentic Narrative*, p. 56). The jealousy of the Russian officers prevented the adoption of the plan, but it is none the less worth calling attention to as the first clear exposition in modern naval war of the great tactical rule of establishing a local superiority, and as identical in principle with that which Nelson carried into effect in the battle of the Nile. On this occasion, however, the plan determined on was to range in line of battle along the line of the enemy, in a manner that could scarcely have obtained any decisive advantage, had not the vice-admiral's ship, as she led in, been disabled and drifted alongside the Turkish admiral. A hand-to-hand encounter between the two ships followed, and ended in both being set on fire, burnt to the water's edge, and blown up. Very few of either ship's company were saved; and the Turks, panic-stricken, cut their cables and fled into the bay of Chesme, which is about one mile broad and two long—a confined space for some two hundred vessels of all sizes. It scarcely needed an experienced officer to see that they could be destroyed by fireships; but the terrible work was carried out under Elphinston's superintendence on the night of the 8th, the fireships being actually commanded by two British lieutenants, Dugdale and Mackenzie. Of the crowd of Turkish ships, one of 64 guns and a few galleys were saved and brought out of the bay; the rest were all destroyed. By the jealousy of the Russian vice-admiral, Elphinston was prevented initiating any further measures of offence; he was thwarted in all his proposals; and when sent, in the following January, to Leghorn, he was desired to go under an assumed name. On his arrival at St. Petersburg he was, however, favourably received by the empress; but the war being ended, he shortly afterwards quitted the Russian service and returned to England. In 1775 he was appointed to command the Egmont of 74 guns, one of the guardships at Portsmouth; and after paying her off in 1778, commissioned the Magnificent, in which, in December, he sailed for the West Indies, under the command of Commodore Rowley. In the West Indies the Magnificent took part in the battle off Grenada, 6 July 1779 [see Byron, Hon. John], and in the three encounters (17 April, 15 and 19 May, 1780) between Rodney and De Guichen [see Rodney, George Brydges]. A few months later she went home with the Jamaica convoy, and was paid off. Towards the end of 1782 Elphinston was appointed to the Atlas of 90 guns, but peace being settled before she was ready for sea, she was put out of com-

mission. Two years after this, 28 April 1785, Elphinston died. It is said (CHARNOCK, vi. 360 *n.*) that 'his lady was delivered in London of a son and heir on 4 May 1773;' but it appears (*Authentic Narrative*, p. 158) that while at Leghorn 'himself and sons went by the name of Howard.' This son, born 4 March 1773 (FOSTER, *Baronetage*), was in fact the third son, and, presumably in memory of the Leghorn incident, was christened Howard; he was created a baronet 25 May 1816. Of the other sons, the eldest, a captain in the Russian navy, died about 1788; the second, a captain in the English navy, died in 1821; both having issue. The several 'Baronetages' now spell the name Elphinstone; but Elphinston himself wrote it without the final 'e.'

[Charnock's Biog. Navalis, vi. 358; Beatson's Nav. and Mil. Memoirs; An Authentic Narrative of the Russian Expedition against the Turks by sea and land, compiled from several authentic journals by an officer on board the Russian Fleet (8vo, 1772).] J. K. L.

ELPHINSTONE, ALEXANDER, fourth LORD ELPHINSTONE (1552–1648 ?), eldest son of Robert, third lord Elphinstone, by his wife, Margaret, daughter of Sir John Drummond of Innerpeffry, was born on 28 May 1552. While still Master of Elphinstone he was admitted a member of the new privy council on 10 April 1599; and through the influence of his younger brother James, then secretary, and afterwards Lord Balmerino, on the 19th of the same month succeeded the Earl of Cassillis as lord high treasurer, and on 17 May following was appointed an extraordinary lord of session. He resigned the post of treasurer, however, in September 1601, 'as was thought, says my author, for adjoining some others with him in the componing of signatures' (CRAWFURD, p. 397). The appointment of these coadjutors was made on 31 July 1601, and will be found in the 'Register of the Privy Council' (vi. 275–276). Elphinstone succeeded his father as the fourth baron in May 1602, and was appointed a lord of the articles on the opening of parliament in April 1604 (*Act Parl.* iv. 261), and one of the commissioners for the union on 11 July in the same year (*ib.* 263–264). He was again appointed a lord of the articles in August 1607 (*ib.* 367). The statement in Lord Hailes's 'Catalogue of the Lords of Session' (1794, p. 7) that Elphinstone was superseded as a judge on 13 Jan. 1610 seems to be a mistake, as his name appears in the ratification in favour of the clerks of session (*Act Parl.* iv. 696), and he probably sat until 1626, when a new commission was made out. In this year the Earl of Mar recovered from him the Kildrummy estate and other property in Aberdeenshire, the judges having held that these estates were not in the lawful possession of James IV when he granted them to the first Lord Elphinstone. According to the principal authorities Elphinstone died in July 1648. A manuscript book in the possession of the present Lord Elphinstone, however, states that he died in Elphinstone on Sunday, 14 Jan. 1638. He married, in 1579, the Hon. Jean Livingston, eldest daughter of William, sixth lord Livingston, by whom he had four sons and five daughters. He was succeeded in the barony by his eldest son, Alexander. The present Lord Elphinstone possesses a full-length portrait, painted on panel, of the fourth lord, dressed in his robes as lord high treasurer of Scotland.

[Brunton and Haig's Senators of the College of Justice (1832), pp. 242–3; Douglas's Peerage of Scotland (1813), i. 538–9, ii. 126; Crawfurd's Officers of the Crown and of the State in Scotland (1726), i. 396–7; Burke's Peerage (1886), p. 495; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, v. lxxxi, lxxxiv, xci, 547, 555, vi. xxix, 287–8, vii. xviii, xxxiv; private information.] G. F. R. B.

ELPHINSTONE, ARTHUR, sixth LORD BALMERINO (1688–1746), Jacobite, son of John, fourth lord Balmerino, by his second wife, Anne, daughter of Arthur Ross, the last archbishop of St. Andrews, was born in 1688. In his speech on the scaffold he said that he had been brought up 'in true, loyal, and anti-revolution principles;' and although under Queen Anne he held command of a company of foot in Lord Shannon's regiment, he was all the time convinced that 'she had no more right to the crown than the Prince of Orange, whom I always looked upon as a vile unnatural usurper.' Nevertheless, on the outbreak of the rebellion of 1715 he at first gave no indications of his sympathy with the movement, and it was only after the battle of Sheriffmuir that he threw up his commission from the government and joined the opposite party, declaring that 'he had never feared death before that day, when he was forced to fight against his conscience.' With other Jacobite leaders he escaped to the continent, where he remained till 1733, when his father, anxious for his return after the death of his brother Alexander in this year, without his knowledge or consent obtained a pardon for him from the government. He thereupon applied for direction to the chevalier, who sent him an answer in his own handwriting permitting him to return, and also gave directions to his bankers in Paris to supply him with any money he might require for his journey. In

1745, on the arrival of the young chevalier, Prince Charles, in Scotland, Elphinstone was one of the first to join his standard. Afterwards on the scaffold he stated, with a pardonable pride in the staunchness of his Jacobitism, that he could easily have excused himself from taking up arms on account of his age, but that he never would have had peace of conscience if he had stayed at home when the young prince was exposed to every kind of danger and hardship. The importance of his accession to the cause was recognised by his being appointed colonel and captain of the second troop of life guards in attendance on the prince. Though not present at Carlisle at the time of its surrender to the rebels, he marched with them to Derby, and also returned with them on their retreat to Scotland. He was present at the battle of Falkirk, but the troops under his command formed part of the reserve. On the death of his half-brother John, third lord Coupar and fifth lord Balmerino (5 Jan. 1746), he succeeded him in both titles. After the battle of Culloden on 16 April following he was taken prisoner by the Grants, who handed him over to the Duke of Cumberland. Having been brought to London he was committed to the Tower, and, along with the Earls of Kilmarnock and Cromarty, was brought to trial at Westminster Hall on 29 July on a charge of high treason. He pleaded not guilty, alleging that he was not present at Carlisle at the time specified in the indictment. He was therefore removed to the Tower, and brought up for trial the next day. Being undefended by counsel, he for some time doggedly held his own against the crown prosecutors, but gradually realising that the evidence against him was too convincing, he resigned the contest, stating that 'he was sorry he had given their lordships so much trouble and that he had nothing more to say.' Horace Walpole, who was present at the trial, in a letter to Horace Mann, states that Balmerino impressed him 'as the most natural brave old gentleman he had ever seen,' and that at the bar 'he behaved himself like a soldier and a man.' Unlike Kilmarnock and Cromarty, he declined to admit that he had committed a crime, or to sue for mercy. When he learned that they had petitioned for mercy, he remarked with caustic scepticism that, as they must have great interest at court, they might have squeezed in his name with their own. He recognised at once that his case was desperate, for, as he said himself, he had been concerned in both rebellions, and had been pardoned once already. To the last, therefore, he was constant to his Jacobite principles, and on the scaffold expressed the hope that 'the world was convinced they stuck to him.' Shortly before his removal to Tower Hill for execution he had an interview with Lord Kilmarnock, to whom he expressed the wish that he alone could pay the reckoning and suffer for both. He 'came upon the scaffold,' says an eye-witness, 'in his regimentals and tye-wig. His coat was blue, turned up with red, and brass buttons; his countenance serene, his air free and easy; he looked quite unconcerned, and like one going on a party of pleasure, or some business of little or no importance.' When he took off his wig he put on a cap made of Scotch plaid, saying he died a Scotsman. He presented the executioner with a fee of three guineas, and his last words were: 'O Lord! reward my friends, forgive my foes, bless King James, and receive my soul!' The decapitation took place on 18 Aug. 1746. A writer in the 'Daily Advertiser' thus described Balmerino: 'His person was very plain, his shape clumsy, but his make strong, and had no marks about him of the polite gentleman, tho' his seeming sincerity recompensed all these defects.' The writer adds that 'several quaint stories are related concerning him which seem to be the growth of wanton and fertile imaginations.' He was buried along with the Earl of Kilmarnock in the chapel of the Tower. By his wife Margaret, daughter of Captain Chalmers, who died at Restalrig on 24 Aug. 1765, he left no issue, and with him the male line of this branch of the Elphinstones and the Balmerino peerage became extinct. There is a portrait of Lord Balmerino from a rare print in Mrs. Thomson's 'Memoirs of the Jacobites,' vol. iii. There is also a print in existence of the date 1746 representing the execution. The coffin-plates of Lords Kilmarnock, Balmerino, and Lovat are engraved in Wilkinson's 'Londina Illustrata.' Robert Burns, writing from Dumfries in 1794 to Mr. James Johnson, says, 'I have got a highland dirk for which I have a great veneration, as it once was the dirk of Lord Balmerino.' He adds that it had been stripped of the silver mounting, and that he had some thoughts of sending it to Johnson to get it mounted anew.

[State Trials, xviii. 442–530; Moore's Compleat Account of the Two Rebel Lords, 1746; Foster's Account, 1746; True Copies of the Papers wrote by Lord Balmerino, &c., and delivered by them to the Sheriffs at the place of execution, 1746, reprinted under the title True Copies of the Dying Declaration of Lord Balmerino, &c., 1750; Seasonable Reflections on the Dying Words and Deportment of the Great but Unhappy Man, Arthur, Lord Balmerino,

1746; The Principles of the British Constitution asserted in An Apology for Lord Balmerino, 1746; Gent. Mag. vol. xvi., and Scots Mag. vol. viii., both of which give copious details in regard to the trial and execution; Jesse's The Pretenders and their Adherents; Walpole's Letters; Douglas's Scotch Peerage (Wood), i. 188–9.]

T. F. H.

ELPHINSTONE, GEORGE KEITH, Viscount Keith (1746–1823), admiral, fifth son of the tenth Lord Elphinstone and grandnephew of Marshal Keith, earl Marischal, after whom he was named, was born at Elphinstone Tower, near Stirling, on 7 Jan. 1745–6. His second brother, Charles, was a midshipman of the Prince George, and perished with her on 13 April 1758 [see Broderick, Thomas]. The third son, William, also entered the navy, but quitted it while still a lad for the service of the East India Company, in which he eventually acquired a considerable fortune. George determined on following his brothers' example, and in 1761 was entered on board the Gosport of 44 guns, under the care of Captain John Jervis, better known as Earl St. Vincent. He afterwards served successively in the Juno, Lively, and Emerald frigates, and in 1767 entered on board an East India Company's ship, commanded by his brother William, with whom he made a voyage to China, for a private venture in which his grand-uncle advanced him 2,000*l.*, thereby enabling him, we are told, to lay the foundation of a pecuniary independence. In December 1769 he was appointed to the Stag frigate going out to the East Indies with the broad pennant of Commodore Sir John Lindsay, by whom, on 28 June 1770, he was promoted to a lieutenant's vacancy. In October he left the Stag and returned to England, and in the following May was appointed to the Trident, flagship of Sir Peter Denis in the Mediterranean. On 18 Sept. 1772 he was promoted to command the Scorpion sloop, and to bring her to England. In December he returned to the Mediterranean in the Scorpion, and commanded her, for the most part at Minorca and on the coast of Italy, till the summer of 1774. On 11 May 1775 he was posted to the Romney, in which he convoyed the trade to Newfoundland, and on his return was appointed in March 1776 to the Perseus frigate. In July he was sent out to New York in charge of convoy, and during the following years was actively employed in cruising against the enemy's privateers or blockade runners, and in co-operating with or supporting the troops on shore. In April and May 1780 he served on shore at the reduction of Charleston, and was afterwards sent to England carrying Captain Hamond with the despatches. On the Perseus paying off, he was immediately appointed to the Warwick of 50 guns, and during the autumn and early winter was principally employed cruising on the Soundings for the protection of the homeward-bound trade. In September 1780 he was returned to parliament for Dumbartonshire. On 5 Jan. 1781, he fell in with and captured the Dutch ship Rotterdam of 50 guns—a capture rendered more brilliant by the fact that a few days before the Rotterdam had beaten off the Isis, a ship of the same nominal force. A few weeks later, 27 March 1781, the Warwick sailed from Cork with a convoy for North America, and continued on that station till the peace. Towards the end of 1781 Prince William Henry, then a midshipman of the Prince George [see Digby, Robert], was placed for some time under Elphinstone's care, and was still with him on 15 Sept. 1782, when the Warwick, in company with the Lion, Vestal, and Bonetta sloop, drove ashore, at the mouth of the Delaware, and captured the Aigle, a powerful 40-gun frigate, together with two smaller vessels. The Gloire, another frigate, escaped up the river into shallow water. On the return of the Warwick to New York, Elphinstone, whose health was failing, was appointed to the Carysfort for the passage to England, where he arrived in the end of November.

For the next ten years Elphinstone lived at home or in London, attending to his duties in parliament as member for Dumbartonshire and after 1790 for Stirlingshire. During this time also he married, 10 April 1787, Jane, eldest daughter and coheiress of Colonel William Mercer of Aldie (Foster, *Peerage*, s.n. 'Nairne'). It was not till war with France was imminent that he applied for a ship; and on 2 Feb. 1793 he was appointed to the Robust of 74 guns, in which a few months later he went out to the Mediterranean with Lord Hood. By the middle of August the fleet was off Toulon, which after some little negotiation was delivered over to the English. On 27 Aug. Elphinstone was landed, with fifteen hundred men, to take possession of Fort La Malgue; and on the 30th, with a joint English and Spanish force numbering six hundred men, he attacked and routed a body of French, which had advanced as far as Ollioules. According to James (i. 77), 'the success of Captain Elphinstone in this affair gained him many compliments on his knowledge of military tactics, so little expected in an officer of the navy.' He had, however, already had some experience of shore fighting at Charleston; and through

the whole period of the occupation, during which he continued governor of La Malgue, he showed that he had fully profited by it. On the night of 17 Dec., when it had been decided to evacuate the place, the embarkation of the troops and of the royalist fugitives was entrusted to Elphinstone; and several thousands were, by his care, conducted safely on board the fleet. In the following spring he returned home in charge of a squadron of the Toulon ships, and received the order of the Bath, 30 May 1794. On 12 April 1794 he was advanced to the rank of rear-admiral; and in the autumn he hoisted his flag in the Barfleur, under Lord Howe, in the Channel fleet. It was for a very few months, for it was decided to take immediate measures to prevent the several Dutch colonies falling into the hands of the French, and Elphinstone happened to have more knowledge of the East than any naval officer then available. It was hoped that the name of the Prince of Orange, who had sought refuge in England, might prevent any opposition; and it was determined, in the first place, to secure the Cape of Good Hope, by friendly negotiation if possible, but if not by force.

Of this expedition and of the whole squadron in Indian waters, Elphinstone was appointed commander-in-chief, and sailed from Spithead on 4 April 1795, with his flag on board the Monarch. His promotion to be vice-admiral was dated 1 June 1795. On 10 June he arrived off Cape Town, where he was joined by Commodore John Blankett [q. v.]; and the weather being stormy the ships went round to Simon's Bay, where the troops were landed. Negotiation proved fruitless. The troops expected from India had not arrived; but the attacks of the colonists became each day more daring, and it was resolved that an advance must be made as far, at least, as Muizenberg, which commanded the road to Cape Town and to the interior. The position held by the enemy was strong, but was exposed to seaward; and on 7 Aug. the guns of a detached squadron, with which Elphinstone was unofficially present, in a few minutes 'obliged the Dutch to abandon their camp with the utmost precipitation.' When the land forces came up, 'after a fatiguing march over heavy sandy ground,' they had little to do but take possession of the abandoned works, though further inland the Dutch held their ground stoutly for some time. For nearly a month longer the little party had to maintain itself under great disadvantages against the unceasing attacks of the Dutch militia. On 4 Sept. the long-looked-for reinforcements arrived; but even then bad weather rendered it for several days impossible to land the troops. By the 13th, however, they were assembled at Muizenberg; on the 14th they moved on, defeated the Dutch in a sharp skirmish at Wynberg, and on the 17th Cape Town capitulated, the garrison becoming prisoners of war. In the decisive result Elphinstone had little share; but the ability and energy which he had displayed in the occupation of Muizenberg won for him the acknowledgments both of his soldier colleagues and of the government. It had been intended that from the Cape Elphinstone should go on to India and seize the Dutch settlements there and in Ceylon; but the delay had given Rear-admiral Rainier time to anticipate him. The work there was already nearly finished, and there was still a good deal to do at the Cape. Elphinstone's health, too, was broken by the strain both of body and mind; and though in January 1796 he went on to Madras, he was unable to take any part in the operations, which came to an end on 15 Feb. with the surrender of Colombo and the whole of Ceylon. Having received intelligence of a Dutch expedition against the Cape, he returned to Simon's Bay in May, but it was August before the Dutch squadron was reported on the coast; and on the 16th he found it at anchor in Saldanha Bay. The force with Elphinstone was so superior that resistance was hopeless; he accordingly demanded the surrender of the ships, which struck their flags the following day, the officers and men becoming prisoners of war. This complete success permitted Elphinstone shortly after to sail for England; he arrived on 3 Jan. 1797, when he received the duplicate of a letter written 20 Nov. offering him an Irish peerage, the patent of which was ultimately issued on 7 March, creating him Baron Keith of Stonehaven Marischal.

A few months later, on the occasion of the mutiny at the Nore, Keith was specially appointed to the command at Sheerness. Both as captain and admiral he had always had the reputation of being lucky; and it was now supposed that his name would go a long way towards bringing the mutineers back to their allegiance. His measures at Sheerness had the happiest effect; and within a week after his arrival the revolted ships began to come in and surrender themselves. Within a fortnight the mutiny was at an end, and Keith was ordered to go to Plymouth and hoist his flag on board the Queen Charlotte as second in command in the Channel. The spirit of disaffection was still strong at Plymouth, but Keith again happily succeeded in bringing the men to listen to reason and

to deliver up the ringleaders. He continued in the Channel till the close of the following year, when he was sent out to the Mediterranean, with his flag in the Foudroyant, as second, under his old chief Lord St. Vincent. The following February he shifted into the Barfleur, and until the beginning of May had the active command before Cadiz; St. Vincent, who was in failing health, remaining at Gibraltar. The divided command was a great misfortune, for St. Vincent was not the man to let his subordinate act independently; and Keith was thus greatly hampered. On 25 April Vice-admiral Bruix got to sea from Brest, with twenty-five ships of the line besides smaller vessels, taking advantage of an easterly gale which blew the blockading squadron off shore. On 3 May Keith had news that the French fleet had been seen two days before off Oporto. He immediately sent on the news to St. Vincent, preparing as he best could for what might happen. Next morning the French were in sight. Keith had with him only fifteen sail of the line, in presence of these twenty-five French ships and twenty-two Spanish in Cadiz. The position seemed critical; but the strong westerly wind prevented the Spaniards from putting to sea, and gave the French enough to do to take care of themselves. The gale freshened; during the night some of the French ships parted company, several were more or less disabled, all were scattered; and Bruix judged that the best thing he could do was to run through the Straits and get to Toulon as fast as possible (Chevalier, *Hist. de la Marine française sous la première République*, 411); he anchored there on the 14th. St. Vincent had at once sent to Keith to join him with his whole squadron, but the westerly gale rendered the communication slow. Keith did not get the message till the evening of the 9th, and it was the 12th before the English fleet could leave Gibraltar. Bruix had been a whole week in the Mediterranean, and whither he had gone, whither he meant to go, or what he meant to do, was a complete mystery. Starting in pursuit, St. Vincent had with him only sixteen sail of the line. At Minorca, on the 20th, he was joined by Sir John Duckworth with four more, and was on his way to Toulon when he learned that the Spanish fleet from Cadiz had also come into the Mediterranean. He did not know that it had put into Cartagena with most of the ships dismasted (*ib.* 411), and accordingly took up a station off Cape St. Sebastian with a view to prevent the two hostile fleets from joining. On the 30th he learned that Bruix had put to sea from Toulon on the 26th, but with what object was unknown. An attack on Nelson at Palermo seemed not improbable, and Duckworth was sent with four ships to reinforce him [see Nelson, Horatio, Viscount Nelson; Duckworth, Sir John Thomas]. The fleet was, however, joined by four other ships under Rear-admiral Whitshed in the Queen Charlotte, and continued off Cape St. Sebastian; but on 2 June St. Vincent, whose health gave way, turned the command over to Keith and sailed for Port Mahon. Keith, left to himself, and having, it may be, a clearer idea of the worthlessness of the Spanish fleet, resolved to quit his strategic station and go to look for the French. On the 3rd, off Toulon, he learned that they had certainly gone eastward; on the 5th that they had been seen only the day before in Vado Bay. The wind was foul, and he was still working up towards Vado when, off Cape delle Mele on the 8th, he received orders from St. Vincent to detach two ships to join Nelson, and to go himself off Rosas to prevent the junction of the French and Spanish fleets. That the order was a blunder is certain. Nelson thought that Keith, being where he was and with better information, ought not to have obeyed it (*Nelson Despatches*, vii. cxcii); Keith judged otherwise, but at the same time so far deviated from the letter of his orders as to take Minorca on the way, thus permitting Bruix, who had weighed from Vado Bay on the 8th, and whom he must have met had he stood on, to hug the French and Spanish shore, and so, passing to the southward, to join the Spaniards at Cartagena on the 23rd. At Minorca, on the 13th, Keith shifted his flag to the Queen Charlotte, and on the 15th received St. Vincent's final resignation of the command. Standing over towards Toulon, he fell in with and captured a squadron of four French frigates returning from the Levant; he looked into Toulon, Genoa, Vado Bay, but could get no news of the French fleet. He returned to Minorca, where, on 7 July, he was reinforced by twelve sail of the line under Sir Charles Cotton, but not till some days later did he know that the French had gone to Cartagena. On 29 July he reached Gibraltar. The combined fleets had passed the Straits three weeks before. They had gone to Cadiz, and had sailed northwards on the 20th. Keith now thought the Channel might be their aim, and followed with all speed. On 12 Aug. he was broad off Ushant; the allies had gone into Brest on the 8th. From the mere fact that in this long and weary cruise he failed to find the enemy's fleet and to bring it to action, Keith's conduct was severely criticised; but he seems to have been in a great measure the victim of circumstances; and the divided command

and St. Vincent's ill-health had enormously increased the inherent difficulties of the problem.

From Brest Keith went with the fleet to Torbay, and in November was ordered to return to the Mediterranean, where the command had been temporarily held by Nelson. He reached Gibraltar on 6 Dec., and was proceeding off Genoa to co-operate with the Austrians when, at Port Mahon, he received intelligence of the pending attempt of a French squadron to relieve their army in Egypt. At Leghorn he was met by Nelson, with the further news that the Russians had withdrawn from the blockade of Malta and gone to Corfu. He resolved, therefore, to occupy the station which these had vacated, in which he would also be well placed to intercept the rumoured French squadron. The speedy capture of the greater part of this set him at liberty to follow out his original design of going to Genoa. In the flagship alone, he went to Leghorn in order to concert measures with the Austrians, and while on shore sent the ship, the Queen Charlotte, to reconnoitre Capraja, which afforded shelter to a swarm of French privateers. The Queen Charlotte sailed from Leghorn at nightfall on 16 March 1800, but remained hove to, some three or four leagues off, waiting to be joined by some officers of the Austrian staff who were to take part in the reconnaissance. These were on their way off the next morning when the ship was seen in the distance enveloped in flames. It was known afterwards that the fire spread from some hay which had been carelessly stacked under the half-deck in the immediate neighbourhood of the match tub (*Minutes of the Court-martial*). The fire spread rapidly, and the ship, one of the largest in the English navy, was utterly destroyed; with her nearly seven hundred of her crew perished. No such terrible accident had occurred since the burning of the Prince George, in which Keith's elder brother had lost his life. Keith now hoisted his flag in the Audacious, and afterwards in the Minotaur. By the beginning of April the Austrians had closed round the French positions near Genoa, and by the 13th had completely hemmed them in. By sea, too, the strictest blockade was established, and after an unsurpassed defence the French capitulated on 4 June. On the 5th, what was left of the garrison marched out with the honours of war, the Austrians took possession of the town, and Keith entered the harbour in the Minotaur. On the 14th Bonaparte's victory at Marengo reversed the position. By the terms of the armistice which immediately followed, Genoa was restored to the French, and they took possession of it with such celerity that Keith had barely time to get his ship outside the Mole before the French had manned the batteries [see Beaver, Philip]. His mortification was excessive, and the more so as he felt that, with the command of the sea, Genoa might have been held, for which purpose he had been urging General Fox at Minorca to send an English garrison. He was now obliged to withdraw, and, going to Leghorn, bade adieu to Nelson, who was going home overland, Keith having been obliged by the exigencies of the station to refuse him permission to go in the Foudroyant, or indeed in any line-of-battle ship.

It had been already determined to push the campaign in Egypt to a conclusion. Affairs there had been strangely complicated by the unwarranted action of Sir William Sidney Smith [q. v.], who had taken on himself to conclude a convention with the French, by the terms of which they were to have a free passage to France. The news of this convention, signed at El Arish on 24 Jan., had reached Keith on his way from Malta to Leghorn, and, as it was contrary to positive orders which had been sent to Smith from Port Mahon on 8 Jan., Keith now referred the matter to the home government, suggesting that the circumstances might change their determination, but announcing his intention of following out his instructions till they were cancelled. Smith wrote to Kleber on 21 Feb. that the convention of El Arish was disallowed by the commander-in-chief, and that the French would not be permitted to quit Egypt except as prisoners of war; expressing, however, his conviction that when the circumstances of the convention were known the difficulty would be done away with. This was, in fact, the case so far as the English government was concerned; and Keith, on 'receiving instructions to allow a passage to the French troops,' had immediately sent orders to Egypt 'to permit them to return to France without molestation.' But before his letter arrived hostilities had recommenced; fresh negotiations were necessary, and were still pending when Kleber was assassinated on 14 June. Keith has been accused of having, in this business, violated the good faith of England (James, ii. 448). In point of fact, and according to the general agreement of jurists (see Nicolas, *Nelson Despatches*, iii. 496*n*.), the validity of the convention depended on the discretion of the commander-in-chief, and Keith was strictly within his right in declining to sanction it, as directly contrary to the orders he had received from home. He did, however, submit to the government the propriety of accepting

it, and it was accepted accordingly, though too late to be of any service.

Meantime Sir Ralph Abercromby [q. v.] had been sent out to the Mediterranean with a large armament. He joined Keith at Leghorn on 1 July; but the plans of the government had been unsettled, and though the troops were there, nothing had been decided as to their destination. In August Keith went to Minorca, shifted his flag to the Foudroyant, and was ordered to prepare, in concert with Abercromby, for a descent on Cadiz. By 5 Oct. they were off Cadiz with a fleet numbering upwards of 130 vessels. A virulent pestilence was carrying off the inhabitants of the city by thousands; and the governor wrote off, deprecating any hostilities against a place in so lamentable a condition. Keith and Abercromby replied in a joint letter that they were 'little disposed to multiply unnecessarily the evils inseparable from war,' but unless the ships of war then in Cadiz were given up they should be obliged to carry out their instructions to take or destroy them. But when the governor's answer came, virtually refusing compliance, the joint commanders had arrived at the conclusion that the expedition was not equal to the undertaking. They accordingly returned straightway to Gibraltar. It is impossible to acquit the two commanders, but more especially Keith, of weakness and vacillation. On 25 Oct. they at length received orders for the invasion of Egypt, and after touching at Malta (which had surrendered on 5 Sept.), sailed for the coast of Caramania, where, in a gale which threatened imminent loss to the whole fleet, they arrived almost by accident in the harbour of Marmorice (Wilson, *Hist. of the Expedition to Egypt*, p. 3; Parson, *Nelsonian Reminiscences*, p. 80) on 1 Jan. 1801, on which day Keith was gazetted to the rank of admiral, on the general promotion accompanying the declaration of the union between Great Britain and Ireland. In Marmorice harbour they were detained till 22 Feb.; on 2 March they anchored in Aboukir Bay; and on the 8th the troops were landed. Keith's share in the ensuing operations was mainly limited to guarding the coast, till, on 2 Sept., the final capitulation was signed, and Alexandria, with all the shipping in the port, was surrendered. The service had been irksome and onerous to an extreme degree, without the redeeming opportunities of distinction. 'It fell to the lot of the army to fight and of the navy to labour,' was Nelson's happy phrase in seconding the vote of thanks in the House of Lords; 'they had equally performed their duty and were equally entitled to thanks.' From the city of London Keith received the freedom of the city and a sword of the value of a hundred guineas; the sultan conferred on him the order of the Crescent; and on 15 Dec. he was raised to the dignity of a peerage of the United Kingdom, with the same title as before.

On the conclusion of the peace Keith was permitted to resign the command to Sir Richard Bickerton. He returned to England in July 1802; but on the fresh outbreak of the war, May 1803, he was appointed commander-in-chief in the North Sea, where, throughout that and the following years, he was closely occupied with preparations for the defence of the coast, eventually extending into the Channel, as far west as Selsea Bill. It was not till after the enemy's scheme of invasion was finally disposed of at Trafalgar that the strain of this command was relaxed; but he continued to hold it till the spring of 1807. On 12 Dec. 1808 he married Hester Maria, daughter of Mrs. Thrale (Piozzi) [see Elphinstone, Hester Maria], now no longer young, and described as having 'strengthened her mental faculties by the severe studies of perspective, fortification, Hebrew, and mathematics.' Notwithstanding this she made Keith an excellent companion in his declining years.

In February 1812 he was appointed commander-in-chief of the Channel fleet, and on 14 May 1814 was advanced to the dignity of viscount. His command seems to have been exercised mainly by deputies afloat, he himself arranging the stations of the several squadrons and superintending the whole. The fleet, indeed, was broken up into numerous small detachments employed on the coast of France or Portugal, in convoy or transport service, the organisation of which was more properly settled in the home ports. It was thus that he had drawn a line of cruisers along the French coasts, even before receiving the news of the battle of Waterloo; and little further preparation was needed to prevent the escape of Bonaparte to America. He was at Plymouth when the news reached him of Bonaparte's having given himself up on board the Bellerophon, and was throughout the intermediary of the government in its correspondence with Bonaparte relative to his being sent to St. Helena. Bonaparte protested vehemently against the treatment to which he was subjected, and endeavoured to draw Keith into arguing the matter; but Keith maintained strict silence on his own part, considering himself merely the mouthpiece of the government. The departure of Bonaparte and the conclusion of peace permitted Keith to retire from active service.

He had accumulated a handsome fortune, and for the remaining years of his life devoted himself to improving and adorning the estate of Tullyallan, on the north bank of the Forth, which he had purchased some time previously, in reclaiming land, and in building embankments and piers, at a large outlay. In 1821 he received from the king of Sardinia the grand cross of the order of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, in recognition of his services at the siege of Genoa. Two years later, 10 March 1823, he died at Tullyallan, and was buried in the parish church, where he had constructed a mausoleum.

The numerous appointments of the first importance which Keith held during his long service, and the many tangled and difficult affairs with which his name is connected, give his career an interest far above what his character seems to warrant. Steady, persevering, and cautious, equal to the necessities of the moment, but in no instance towering above them, he made few serious mistakes, he carried out satisfactorily the various operations entrusted to him, and left behind him the reputation of a good rather than of a great commander. His portrait by Hoppner has been frequently engraved; a copy of it in photogravure is given in Allardyce's 'Life.' Another portrait by Owen is in the Painted Hall at Greenwich, the gift of his widow.

By his first marriage Keith had one daughter, Margaret Mercer Elphinstone [q. v.], who in 1817 married the Comte de Flahault, aide-de-camp of Napoleon, and French ambassador in London. The Comtesse de Flahault was in her own right, on the father's side, Baroness Keith, and on the mother's side Baroness Nairne. On her death in 1867 the barony of Keith became extinct; that of Nairne descended to her daughter Emily, wife of the late, and mother of the present, Marquis of Lansdowne. By his second marriage Keith had also one daughter, who married, first, the Hon. Augustus John Villiers, second son of the fifth Earl of Jersey; and secondly, Lord William Godolphin Osborne, brother of the eighth Duke of Leeds.

[Allardyce's Life of Admiral Lord Keith (1882), a clumsy, crude, and inaccurate compilation; Marshall's Royal Naval Biography, i. 43; Naval Chronicle, x. 1; Nicolas's Nelson Despatches; James's Naval History (edit. 1860); Chevalier's Hist. de la Marine Française; Official Documents in the Public Record Office.]

J. K. L.

ELPHINSTONE, HESTER MARIA, Viscountess Keith (1762–1857), the eldest daughter of Henry Thrale by his wife Hester, afterwards Mrs. Piozzi, was born in 1762. From 1765, when Dr. Johnson first became intimate with her parents, she figured constantly as 'Queenie.' Johnson wrote childish rhymes for her, played horses with her, wrote to her, and directed her education. The death of her only brother in 1776 made her a rich heiress. In 1778, her sixteenth year, Miss Burney describes her as 'a very fine girl, about fourteen years of age, but cold and reserved, though full of knowledge and intelligence.' In 1781 her father died. She remained with her mother, and in company with her young sisters at Bath continued her education under her by reading history and the poets. When her mother agreed to marry Piozzi, Hester retired to her father's Brighton house, where she saw no company, and studied Hebrew and mathematics. In 1784, when her mother and Piozzi were in Italy, she took a house in London for herself and her sisters. On 10 Jan. 1808, at Ramsgate, she married Admiral Lord Keith [q. v.], who had then been a widower some years, her new homes being Tulliallan, on the Firth of Forth, and Purbrook Park, Edinburgh; and on 12 Dec. 1809, in Harley Street, London, she gave birth to her only child, a daughter.

Lady Keith was one of the original patronesses of Almack's. She became viscountess in 1814, on the elevation of the admiral to the English peerage, and, together with her stepdaughter, the Hon. Margaret Mercer Elphinstone [q. v.], she was prominent in society during the regency and the next two or three decades in London and Edinburgh. In 1823 she was left a widow. Towards 1850 she retired from company and devoted herself to works of charity. She died on 31 March 1857 at her house, 110 Piccadilly. The viscountess's daughter (Georgiana Augusta Henrietta) married the Hon. Augustus Villiers, second son of the Earl of Jersey.

[Gent. Mag. lxxviii. i. 85, lxxix. ii. 1173; 3rd ser. ii. 615–16; Annual Register, xcix. 299; Allardyce's Memoirs of G. K. Elphinstone, p. 349; Boswell's Johnson (1823 ed.), iii. 9, iv. 310; Mme. d'Arblay's Diary (1854 ed.), i. 49, 58, 88, 102, &c., ii. 256, 274, vii. 244–5, &c.; Russell's Moore, v. 8–13, 183, vii. 262, &c.]

J. H.

ELPHINSTONE, Sir HOWARD (1773–1846), major-general, sixth son of John Elphinstone, lieutenant-general and vice-admiral in the Russian service, who commanded the Russian fleet in the Baltic in 1769, was born on 4 March 1773. He entered the army as a second lieutenant in the royal engineers on 17 Oct. 1793, and first saw service in the capture of the Cape of Good Hope in 1795. He was promoted first lieutenant on 5 Feb. 1796, and proceeded to India, where he became captain-lieutenant on 1 July 1800. In the following year he accompanied the

division sent from India to Egypt, under Sir David Baird, as commanding royal engineer. In 1806 he was attached to the special mission to Portugal of Lord Rosslyn and General Simcoe, to advise the Portuguese government on the defence of Lisbon, and in the latter part of the same year he accompanied Major-general Whitelocke to South America as commanding royal engineer. In 1808 he went in the same capacity to the Peninsula with the force under Sir Arthur Wellesley, and was severely wounded at the battle of Roliça, for his services at which battle he received the gold medal. He had been promoted captain on 1 March 1805, and he was further promoted major by brevet on 1 Jan. 1812, and in that year ordered to the Peninsula again. While Sir Richard Fletcher was the commanding royal engineer in the Peninsula, Major, or lieutenant-colonel, Elphinstone, as he became on 21 July 1813, remained in Portugal, but when that officer was killed before San Sebastian, Elphinstone, as senior officer of the royal engineers, asserted his right to be present at headquarters. Wellington would have preferred to keep Lieutenant-colonel (afterwards Field-marshal Sir) John Fox Burgoyne, who had long been with him, and knew his ways as commanding royal engineer, especially as he was in the army, though not in the corps of royal engineers, senior to Elphinstone, but he had to yield to the latter's demand and summon him to the front. Elphinstone therefore superintended the passage of the Adour as commanding royal engineer, and held that post at the battles of the Nivelle and the Nive, for which he received two clasps. He was then left by Wellington with Sir John Hope to form the siege of Bayonne, while Burgoyne accompanied the headquarters of the army in the pursuit after Soult. At the end of the war, when honours were freely bestowed on the leaders of the Peninsular army, Elphinstone was fortunate enough to be rewarded as commanding royal engineer with a baronetcy, and he was also made a C.B. Elphinstone did not again see service; he was promoted colonel on 2 Dec. 1824, and major-general on 10 Jan. 1837, and died at Ore Place, near Hastings, on 28 April 1846.

[Royal Military Calendar; Gent. Mag. July 1846.] H. M. S.

ELPHINSTONE, JAMES, first Lord Balmerino (1553?-1612), the third son of Robert, third lord Elphinstone, by Margaret, daughter of Sir John Drummond of Innerpeffray, was born about 1553. He was appointed a lord of session 4 March 1586, and in 1595 was one of the powerful commissioners of the treasury known as the Octavians. In 1598 he became secretary of state, and for the next five years was a member of all the more important commissions of the privy council. He was a great favourite with James, whom in 1603 he accompanied to London. On 20 Feb. 1604 he was created a peer, with the title of Lord Balmerino, the estates of the Cistercian abbey of Balmerino in Fifeshire being converted into a temporal lordship in favour of him and his heirs male. In the same year he was nominated one of the Scotch commissioners to treat about the union with England, and when the negotiations were at an end he was chosen by the privy council of Scotland to convey their thanks to James, a sum of 2,000*l.* being allowed him for the expenses of the journey. In March 1605 he was made president of the court of session, and while holding that office successfully opposed Dunbar. It was believed that James intended to appoint him secretary of state in England, but an end was put to his further promotion by his speedy disgrace. In 1599 a letter signed by James had been sent to Pope Clement VIII, requesting him to give a cardinal's hat to Drummond, bishop of Vaizon (a kinsman of Balmerino), and expressing high regard for the pope and the catholic faith. The Master of Gray sent a copy of this letter to Elizabeth, who asked James for an explanation. He asserted that the letter must be a forgery, and Balmerino, as secretary of state, also repudiated its authorship. When in 1607 James published his 'Triplici nodo triplex cuneus,' Cardinal Bellarmine quoted at length the letter written in 1599 as a proof of James's former favour to catholicism. James sent for Balmerino, who then, it was alleged, confessed that he had written the letter, and had surreptitiously passed it in among papers awaiting the king's signature. He was accordingly put on his trial, when he refused to plead, but he acquitted the king of any knowledge of the letter written to the pope, which he said had been sent by himself as a matter of policy. The king confirming the verdict of guilty which the jury found, Balmerino was in March 1609 sentenced to be beheaded, quartered, and demeaned as a traitor. The sentence, however, was not carried out, for reasons which are made clear by an account of the affair privately drawn up by Balmerino. According to this document, James was by no means averse to correspondence with Clement, but had scruples about addressing him by his apostolical titles, which were therefore afterwards prefixed by Balmerino to the letter which James, who was aware of its contents, had signed without hesitation. When the matter was brought up again in 1608, severe

pressure was put by Dunbar and Cecil on Balmerino to induce him to take the whole blame on himself, and on the promise that his life and estates should be secured to him he consented to exculpate the king. He remained imprisoned at Falkland till October 1609, when, on finding security in 40,000*l.*, he was allowed free ward in the town and a mile round. Afterwards he was permitted to retire to his own estate at Balmerino, where he died in July 1612. He married, first, Sarah, daughter of Sir John Menteith, by whom he had one son, John, second lord Balmerino; secondly, Marjory, daughter of Hugh Maxwell of Tealing, by whom he had a son James, created in 1607 Lord Coupar, and two daughters, Anne and Mary.

[Douglas and Wood's Peerage of Scotland, i. 182, 538; Anderson's Scottish Nation, i. 228; Burton's Hist. of Scotland to 1688, vi. 138; Laing's Hist. of Scotland, iii. 59–61; Calderwood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland, pp. 312, 364, 427; Chronicle of Kings of Scotland (Maitland Club Publications), p. 176; Register of Privy Council of Scotland, vi. 276, vii. 340, and passim; Cal. State Papers (Dom. Ser. 1603–14), pp. 466, 497, (1611–18) 137.] A. V.

ELPHINSTONE, JOHN, second Lord Balmerino (*d.* 1649), was the son of James, first lord Balmerino [q. v.], by his first wife, Sarah, daughter of Sir John Menteith of Carse. His father being under attainder when he died in 1612, the title did not devolve on him, but he was restored to blood and peerage by a letter under the great seal, 4 Aug. 1613. He was a strenuous opponent of the ecclesiastical policy of Charles in Scotland, and distinguished himself more particularly in the parliament of 1633 by his hostility to the act establishing the royal prerogative of imposing apparel upon churchmen. Although, however, a majority of the members voted against the measure, the clerk affirmed that the question was carried in the affirmative. When his decision was objected to, Charles, who was present, insisted that it must be held good unless the clerk were accused from the bar of falsifying the records. This being a capital offence, the accuser was liable to the punishment of death if he failed in the proof, and no one caring to incur the risk, the decision was not further challenged. William Haig of Bemersyde, solicitor to James I, and one of those opposed to the measure, thereupon drew up a petition to be signed by his party, setting forth their grievances and praying for redress. It was couched in rather plain language, and asserted that the recent ecclesiastical legislation had imposed 'a servitude upon this church unpractised before.' The king peremptorily declined to look at it, and ordered a stop to be put to all such proceedings. The matter was therefore delayed, but Balmerino retained a copy, which, having interlined it in some places with his own hand, he showed to his confidential agent, Dunmore. Through a breach of confidence it was forwarded by a friend of Dunmore's to Spotiswood, archbishop of St. Andrews, who, supposing it was being sent about for signatures, laid the matter before the king. Haig made his escape to the continent, but Balmerino, by a warrant of the privy council, was brought before Spotiswood, who sent him a prisoner to the castle of Edinburgh. His imprisonment occurred as early as June 1634, and the final trial was not till the following March. Hill Burton suggests that the delay was owing to hesitation whether to prosecute or not (*Hist. Scot.* vi. 97), but the succinct yet circumstantial narrative of Sir James Balfour (*Annals*, ii. 216–19) clearly proves that the aim was to leave no means untried to secure a conviction. In June he was indicted before the justice-general, William, earl of Errol, lord high constable of Scotland, on the accusation of the king's advocate, Sir Thomas Hope, the court sitting into July. So unmistakably hostile was public opinion to the proceedings, that Balmerino was conveyed each day to and from the castle under a strong escort. Before a decision was arrived at, a warrant came postponing the matter till 12 Nov., when, after it had been under consideration for twelve days, another warrant came to add four assistants to the justice-general, who, says Balfour, 'were men sworn to the bishops and favourers of the corruptions of the time.' At last, after long debate, the charge was found relevant in three points: the keeping or concealing of a libel against the king's authority, the failing to apprehend the original author of the libel, and the being art and part in the fabrication of the libel, from the fact that certain parts were admitted to have been underlined by him. The matter was then ordered to be tried by a jury, who were carefully selected by the government. The trial came on in March 1635, and the charge being finally narrowed down to the one count that he, knowing the author of what was held to be a dangerous and seditious libel, failed to discover him, he was found guilty by eight to seven, and sentenced to death. Before the trial came on, William Drummond of Hawthornden [q. v.] had written an 'Apologetical Letter' to the Earl of Ancrum (published in Drummond, *Works*) in the expectation that it would be shown to Charles, in which he described such a pro-

secution as in the highest degree impolitic, and said it was sometimes 'great wisdom in a prince not to reject or disdain those who freely told him his duty.' The trial was a mere burlesque of the forms of justice. The excitement of the people became almost uncontrollable, and while protests against the sentence being carried out were made at crowded meetings, many vowed that if a pardon were not granted they would either set him at liberty or revenge his death on the judge and the jurors who voted against him. Traquair thereupon hastened to Charles and represented to him that the execution was unadvisable, and Laud concurring, Balmerino was reluctantly pardoned, but was ordered to be confined for life within six miles of his house at Balmerino. Afterwards he obtained full liberty, 'to the king's great grief,' says Spalding, 'for this his goodness' (*Memorials*, i. 61). Burnet states that his father told him 'that the ruin of the king's affairs in Scotland was in a great measure owing to that prosecution' (*Own Times*, ed. 1838, p. 14). Balmerino was one of those who attended the meeting of the lords called by Lord Lorne, afterwards Marquis of Argyll, at which they began to 'regrait their dangerous estait with the pryd and avarice of the prelatis' (Spalding, *Memorials*, i. 79), and resolved to make a determined stand against the introduction of 'innovations' in worship. Along with Loudoun and Rothes he revised the additions to the covenant in February 1638 (Rothes, *Relation*, p. 79). In the assembly of 1638 he resolved to be 'well near mute' (Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, i. 125), but he served on several committees, and on 3 Oct. he signed the protest to the king's commissioner at Hamilton against his endeavours to induce the members of the assembly to sign the 'king's covenant' (Balfour, *Annals*, ii. 296; Gordon, *Scots Affairs*, ii. 127). Guthrie ascribes to Balmerino, along with Hope and Henderson, the pamphlet called 'An Informatione for Defensive Arms' (printed in Stevenson's 'History of the Church of Scotland,' ii. 686–95), maintaining the 'reason and necessity' of the covenanters to defend themselves against the king by force of arms. He was also one of the principal advisers of the covenanters in sending a letter to Louis XIII against 'the tyrannical proceedings of their monarch.' Of this Charles took special notice in his 'Large Declaration concerning the late Troubles in Scotland,' reproaching him for his ingratitude both to himself and to James VI, to whom he owed both his barony and his whole fortune. Balmerino was one of the ablest and most prominent supporters of Argyll in his policy against Charles. When the covenanters resolved to take up arms, he aided them with large sums of money, contributing at least forty thousand merks (Balfour, *Annals*, iii. 240). Along with the Earl of Rothes and others he proceeded on 22 March 1639 to Dalkeith to demand the delivery to them of the palace by the lord treasurer Traquair, and to bring the royal ensigns of the kingdom, the crown, sword, and sceptre, to the castle of Edinburgh (*ib.* ii. 322). At the opening of the famous Scottish parliament in August 1641, he was nominated president by the king and unanimously elected (*ib.* iii. 45). On 17 Sept. his name appeared among the list of privy councillors nominated by the king (*ib.* 67), and it was one of those approved of by the parliament (*ib.* 150). On 17 Nov. he was chosen an extraordinary lord of session. He accompanied General Leslie in his march into England in 1643 (Spalding, *Memorials*, ii. 298). In July 1644 he was nominated one of the commissioners to England (Balfour, *Annals*, iii. 206). When, after the disastrous campaigns of Argyll, the command of the covenanters was entrusted to Sir William Baillie, Balmerino was one of the committee of estates nominated to advise him (Spalding, ii. 462). He died on the last day of February 1649, of apoplexy in his own chamber in Edinburgh, having the previous evening supped with the Marquis of Argyll, and gone to bed apparently in good health (Balfour, *Annals*, iii. 388). He was buried in the vaulted cemetery of the Logan family, adjoining the church of Restalrig, but according to Scot of Scotstarvet, the soldiers of Cromwell disinterred the body in 1650 while searching for leaden coffins, and threw it into the street. By Anne, daughter of Sir Thomas Ker of Fernyhirst, and sister of Andrew and James, lords Jedburgh, and of Robert Car [q. v.], earl of Somerset, he had a son John, who succeeded him as third earl. Balmerino was the author of a speech on the army published in 1642.

John Elphinstone, third Lord Balmerino (1623–1704), lost most of his landed property by lawsuits, and was fined 6,000*l.* Scots by the parliament of 1662 for having conformed under the commonwealth. His successor (by his wife Margaret, daughter of John Campbell, earl of Loudoun), John Elphinstone, fourth Lord Balmerino, born 26 Dec. 1682, a distinguished lawyer, was a privy councillor 16 Aug. 1687; opposed the union; was elected a representative of the peers in 1710 and 1713; was expelled from his offices in 1714; and died at Leith 13 May 1736. His son Arthur is noticed above.

[Balfour's Annals of Scotland; Baillie's Letters and Journals (Bannatyne Club); Burnet's Own Times; Rushworth's Historical Collections, pt. ii. 281; Gordon's Scots Affairs (Spalding Club); Spalding's Memorials (Spalding Club); Rothes's Relation concerning the Affairs of the Kirk of Scotland (Bannatyne Club); Hailes's Memorials, containing many letters to him from Johnstone of Warriston; State Trials, iii. 587–711; Douglas's Scottish Peerage (Wood); Haig and Brunton's Senators of the College of Justice, pp. 313–17; Walpole's Royal and Noble Authors; Laing's History of Scotland; Hill Burton's History of Scotland; Gardiner's History of England.] T. F. H.

ELPHINSTONE, JOHN, thirteenth Lord Elphinstone (1807–1860), governor of Madras and Bombay, only son of John, twelfth lord Elphinstone in the peerage of Scotland, a lieutenant-general in the army, and colonel of the 26th regiment, was born on 23 June 1807. He succeeded his father as Lord Elphinstone in May 1813, and entered the army in 1826 as a cornet in the royal horse guards. He was promoted lieutenant in that regiment in 1828, and captain in 1832, and was a lord in waiting to William IV from 1835 to 1837. The king took a fancy to him, and made him a G.C.H. in 1836, in which year he was sworn of the privy council. In 1837 he left the guards on being appointed governor of Madras by Lord Melbourne. It was said at the time that his appointment was made in order to dissipate an idle rumour which was current that the young queen had fallen in love with the handsome guardsman. He was governor of Madras from 1837 to 1842 during very quiet times, and the only notable fact of his administration was his building a house at Káiti, in the Nílgiri Hills, and his efforts to bring those hills into use as a hot-weather residence for the Europeans in the presidency. On resigning his governorship in 1842 he travelled for some years in the East, and he was one of the first Englishmen to explore Cashmere. He returned to England in 1845, and in 1847 was appointed by Lord John Russell to be a lord in waiting to the queen, an office which he held until 1852, and again under Lord Aberdeen's administration from January to October 1853, when he was appointed governor of Bombay. Elphinstone's second governorship in India was far more important than his first, for during it the Indian mutiny broke out in 1857. His conduct during that crisis was admirable; he not only promptly checked the attempts made at a rising at a few places in his presidency, and put down the insurrection of the rájá of Sholapur, but discovered a more serious conspiracy in Bombay itself, of which he held the threads until the right moment, when he seized upon the ringleaders and prevented the conspiracy from coming to anything. Still more praiseworthy was his promptitude in sending every soldier he could despatch to the more threatening localities, almost stripping his presidency of European troops, and his services on this account were only second in importance to those of Sir John Lawrence in the Punjab. For these services he was made a G.C.B. in 1858, and on 21 May 1859, on his return to England, he was created a peer of the United Kingdom as Lord Elphinstone of Elphinstone, Stirlingshire. He did not long survive the effects of the Indian climate, and died unmarried in King Street, St. James's, London, on 19 July 1860, when his peerage of the United Kingdom became extinct.

[Gent. Mag. August 1860; Kaye and Malleson's Hist. of the Indian Mutiny for Elphinstone's conduct during the mutiny.] H. M. S.

ELPHINSTONE, MARGARET MERCER, Comtesse de Flahault, Viscountess Keith, and Baroness Nairne (1788–1867), only child of George Keith Elphinstone, viscount Keith [q. v.], admiral, by his first wife, Jane, only child and heiress of William Mercer of Aldie, Perth, was born in Hertford Street, Mayfair, 12 June 1788, and in 1789 lost her mother, to whose right to the barony of Nairne (at that time in attainder) she then succeeded. She was early brought into the circle of the Princess Charlotte of Wales, whose attached friend and confidante she became; and this position raised a rumour against her (which, however, she was able entirely to refute) that she betrayed the princess's secrets to the prince regent. On 20 June 1817, at Edinburgh, she married the Comte de Flahault, aide-de-camp to Bonaparte, who had been educated in this country, and had taken refuge here on the restoration of the Bourbons. The countess took a prominent place in society. Her husband held office under the Bourbons. He was ambassador successively at Rome, at Vienna, and (1860) at St. James's, and finally resided at Paris as chancellor of the Legion of Honour. The countess took part in all his social and political work. References to her hospitalities abound in Moore's letters and diary and elsewhere.

The countess died at her husband's official residence, Paris, on 12 Nov. 1867, aged 79. She had two children, daughters, the elder of whom (who succeeded to her English and Irish titles) was Dowager Marchioness of Lansdowne at the time of her death, and the younger, Mlle. de Flahault, was unmarried.

[Allardyce's Memoirs of G. K. Elphinstone, 58, 418–19; Gent. Mag. lxxxvii. ii. 81; Times, 15 Nov. 1867, p. 7, col. 2; Russell's Moore, iii. 98, 99, 104, 111, 112, &c., vii. 186, &c.; see also Miss Knight's Autobiography.] J. H.

ELPHINSTONE, MOUNTSTUART (1779–1859), governor of Bombay, fourth son of John, eleventh Baron Elphinstone, and his wife, Anne, daughter of Lord Ruthven, was born 6 Oct. 1779, and passed his early years at Cumbernauld in Dumbartonshire. His father, a general officer, being appointed governor of Edinburgh Castle, Elphinstone spent some of his boyhood there, and attended the high school of the town in 1791–2, after which he was removed to a school at Kensington kept by a Dr. Thompson. Elphinstone obtained an appointment in the Bengal civil service by the interest of an uncle, who was a member of the court of directors, and landed at Calcutta 26 Feb. 1796. He was at that time a clever but not particularly studious youth, full of energy and high spirits, fond of desultory reading, and much disposed to sympathise with the principles of the French revolution. His earliest predilections had been for a military career. His brother being at Benares, Elphinstone was posted to that station by the favour of Sir John Shore, the governor-general. Here he served under Mr. Davis, the magistrate of the district, by whose influence and example he was first led to the study of Indian literature. He passed much of his time in repairing the defects of his school education, and laid the foundation for that love of the classics which ever afterwards formed the chief amusement of his leisure hours. In May 1798, Vazir Ali, who had lately been deposed from the nawabship of Oudh by Shore and made to reside at Benares, murdered the resident and attempted a general massacre of all the Europeans at the station. Elphinstone was only saved by the fleetness of his horse. In 1801 he proceeded to Calcutta to attend the college of Fort William, then newly opened for the instruction of the young officers of the civil service. He joined on 1 Jan. 1801, and on 6 March set off on a circuitous land journey to join a new appointment as assistant to the governor-general's agent at the court of the peshwa at Poona; E. Strachey being at the same time appointed to the post of secretary. The young men travelled together, marching through 'the Northern Sircars' to Madras, and proceeding thence across the breadth of the Deccan. Elphinstone's journal abounds in interesting remarks upon the scenery and people of the countries traversed, and at the same time presents constant records of study. Then, as always, Elphinstone appears as the omnivorous recipient of the most varied mental food, extending from Horace, Anacreon, and Háfiz, to the writings of Bacon, Warburton, Hume, and Schiller, Timur's 'Memoirs,' Orme's 'Indostan,' and novels innumerable. He combined through life a love of books with a love of sport and a devotion to public business. Early in 1802 Elphinstone arrived at Poona. The then peshwa, Bajee Rao, representative of the Brahmin dynasty, who, from being minister at the court of Satára, had risen to the virtual head of the Mahratta confederacy, was an avowed poltroon. On Sindhia coalescing with the bhonsla of Berar in a manner which threatened the stability of Wellesley's arrangements, war was declared against him by the British. Lake was sent with an army into Hindustan, and Wellesley took the field in the Deccan, Elphinstone being attached to his staff. At the battle of Assaye, 23 Sept. 1803, he was by the general's side, and his letters contain animated pictures of the action. This was in September. Little more than two months after, Elphinstone took part in the battle of Argaum, where he charged with the cavalry. The campaign virtually ended with the siege of Gáwilgarh, where Elphinstone mounted the breach with the storming party. On the restoration of tranquillity, Elphinstone was appointed, on the strong recommendation of the general, to the important post of resident at the court of the bhonsla at Nagpur. He owed this rapid advancement solely to his conspicuous services and merits. Not only did the general dwell upon these in despatches to his all-powerful brother, but on parting he paid Elphinstone what he doubtless intended for the highest possible compliment by saying that Elphinstone had 'mistaken his profession and ought to have been a soldier.'

At Nagpur Elphinstone remained four years and a half, during which his time was almost entirely divided between sport and study; but his diplomatic conduct, although not conspicuous in history, was evidently approved by his employers. In the middle of 1808 he was appointed ambassador to the Afghán court of Cábul, where Shah Shuja, afterwards Lord Auckland's unfortunate *protégé*, was on the precarious throne of that turbulent region. A French embassy was now at the court of Persia, with a justly suspected outlook towards India, and it was deemed of the highest importance to establish British influence in the Punjab, in Sindh, and in the Afghán country. Towards this purpose, however, Elphinstone's mission effected little. He was not allowed to penetrate

further than Peshawur, where the Afghan ruler met him and engaged him in vain negotiations. Demands of aid, which was not within the scope of Elphinstone's instructions, had to be resisted, however courteously. Before long Shuja's army met with a reverse in Cashmere. The fall of his power approached, and Elphinstone came away unsuccessful as an envoy, but stored with information, and already nursing that germ of frontier policy of which he was afterwards to be the fruitful founder and exponent. He also propounded schemes for acquiring the mastery of lands beyond the Indus, which met with disapprobation in the Calcutta council, though afterwards included in the defensive arrangements which have, for the most part, subsisted to the present day. Reflecting on his mission, a few years later, Elphinstone penned a masterly state paper, which it is not too much to call the foundation of all but continuous subsequent policy. In 1810 Elphinstone was appointed resident at Poona. The peshwa chafed under the British protectorate, when the dangers which had once made it acceptable seemed to have ceased. Four years passed quickly in Elphinstone's usual pursuits; but in 1815, during the course of negotiations with a neighbouring Mahratta chief, the peshwa connived at the murder of that prince's envoy. As all questions of the foreign relations of the state were placed by the treaty under the control of the British government, Elphinstone at once interfered. In a calm and courteous memorial he pointed out to the peshwa that all available presumptions and proofs pointed to his highness's favourite Trimbukjee Danglia as the ultimate criminal. Accordingly he demanded justice. The peshwa shuffled. Trimbukjee was sent into an illusory arrest, from which he soon escaped; and Elphinstone at once prepared for a struggle. On 10 May 1816 he received due instructions from Calcutta. On 13 June the peshwa signed a new treaty, ostensibly complying with the demands of the British government; and the next day Elphinstone had the mortification of finding himself superseded by Sir T. Hislop, the general commanding the army preparing in Central India. It was no doubt an advantage that the army organised by Lord Hastings to act against the Pindarrees was so near; but Elphinstone might fairly complain that the conduct of the operations at Poona was taken from his hands. Nevertheless complaint was not in his nature, and he fell as usual into his favourite literary occupations, with an exclamation of '*οὐ φροντὶς Ἱπποκλείδῃ*,' his favourite quotation from Herodotus. Not only was the general put over him, but the general confided the management of Poona affairs not to Elphinstone but to Sir John Malcolm, from whose interposition some trouble promised to arise. Yet Elphinstone continued to work honestly, though only in a subordinate capacity; and his friendly feelings for Malcolm suffered no interruption. The subsidiary force was ordered to take part in the general campaign against the Pindarrees, the irritated peshwa being at the same time allowed to make a large addition to his own forces, ostensibly for the same object. 'I think,' wrote Elphinstone to General Smith, 'we risk a good deal by sending all the troops out of this country, after encouraging the peshwa to put himself into a situation to profit by their absence . . . but I would rather run a good deal of risk . . . than have your force thrown out of the campaign and Sir T. Hislop's detained.'

The storm soon broke. The letter to General Smith was written on 5 Oct. 1817. On the 18th the peshwa began to hem in the residency, and Elphinstone ordered up reinforcements for its defence. On the afternoon of 5 Nov. the peshwa moved to the attack, and Elphinstone quietly evacuated the residency and retired to the camp at Kirkee. The Mahrattas fell upon the abandoned residency, which was burned with all that it contained, including Elphinstone's beloved books and the whole of his private property. About sunset the small British force advanced, and, after a sharp contest, rolled back the surging tide of Mahratta bravado. Order was restored by the return of Smith with his column, but the honours of war fell by acclamation to Elphinstone. In moving for a vote of thanks in the House of Commons, Canning declared that Elphinstone had 'exhibited military courage and skill which, though valuable accessories, are talents we are not entitled to require as necessary qualifications for civil employment.'

Elphinstone was now, at last, invested with full power to conduct the war, and instructed to annex the peshwa's territory—a policy to which personally he was opposed. He installed the raja of Satára, however, and did all that lay in his power for the dwindled Mahratta state. While thus occupied he received the offer of the governorship of Bombay, which he accepted, though he did not join until he had taken all necessary steps for organising the administration of the newly acquired territory.

The period of Elphinstone's rule at Bombay, 1819–27, was one of a new sort of activity, for which he showed at first some distaste. But he left his mark there pre-

paring a complete code of laws, which subsisted for forty years, and laying the foundation of a system of public education under which that portion of the empire has made enormous progress. His retirement was marked by the people in a manner peculiarly acceptable to its recipient's taste and character. It was resolved to found a college in Bombay bearing his name, and endowed for the teaching of those subjects in which he took the deepest and most abiding interest. And when the proposal was notified to him he characteristically welcomed it, eagerly replying, 'Hoc mille potius signis.'

From November 1827 to May 1829 Elphinstone travelled, principally in Greece, then in the midst of her deliverance from Turkish domination. He visited Athens, still garrisoned by the Porte, and made the acquaintance of the Greek leaders Capo d'Istria and Colocotroni. Wintering in Italy he passed through Paris in April, and finally returned to London, after an absence of thirty-three years. No 'honours,' in the vulgar sense of the word, awaited him. A baronetcy had already been declined by his friends, with his cordial acquiescence. His unambitious spirit shrank from a seat in parliament, and he declined the successive offers of the governor-generalship of India, the permanent under-secretaryship of the board of control, and a special mission to Canada. With chambers in the Albany and quarters in friendly country houses, he occupied the earlier years of his retirement in study, interrupted by visits to Italy. He moved in London society, becoming a member of the 'Dilettanti,' and attending occasionally at public dinners and meetings. He gave evidence before the lords' committee on Indian affairs, and wrote papers of full and valuable information and opinions whenever consulted on such subjects. His leisure was devoted to the composition of his well-known 'History of India,' which will probably continue the most popular work on that country. In 1847 he took a house in Surrey, and lived for twelve years more, a secluded but by no means idle invalid. He recorded his dissent from the annexationist policy which is connected with the name of Lord Dalhousie, and it appears certain that his opinions had great weight in the new departure which marked the administration of Indian affairs after the suppression of the mutiny. His latest writings evinced no sign of failing powers. The end came softly and swiftly. He was seized in his house of Hookwood by paralysis on the night of 20 Nov. 1859, and died soon after without recovering his senses. He was buried in the adjoining churchyard of Limpsfield, a statue being raised in his honour in St. Paul's Cathedral. Macaulay pronounced him 'a great and accomplished man' (*Life*, ii. 404). It is hardly necessary to point out the extraordinary qualities displayed in the story thus briefly told. Elphinstone was apparently quite devoid of those ardent religious feelings which have inspired so many Indian heroes. In one of his later journals he makes his one allusion to religion; it is an encomium on Pope's 'Universal Prayer.' His attitude through life was rather that of an ancient philosopher. It is remarkable that a man so sceptical, retiring, unselfish, and modest should be one of the chief founders of the Anglo-Indian empire; that a man in youth a student and a sportsman, in later life almost an anchorite, should have been nominated repeatedly for the higher offices of state, and consulted as an oracle by the rulers of his country, yet never derive the smallest personal advantage from his position. A posthumous volume on 'The Rise of British Power in the East' was brought out in 1887 under the able editorship of Sir E. Colebrooke. It is quite unfinished, and less important in all respects than his 'History of the Hindu and Muhamadan Periods,' but it shows his characteristic qualities of conscientiousness and impartiality. The fragment on the character of Clive is particularly fine.

[The chief materials for Elphinstone's biography are to be found in Sir Edward Colebrooke's Life, 1884. The events of his public career are related in James Mill's Hist. of India, continued by Wilson; and in Grant Duff's Hist. of the Mahrattas. An interesting sketch of him as governor of Bombay will be found in Bishop Heber's Indian Journal.] H. G. K.

ELPHINSTONE, WILLIAM (1431–1514), bishop of Aberdeen and founder of Aberdeen University, was born at Glasgow in 1431. He is stated to have been the son of William Elphinstone of Blythswood, Lanarkshire, a connection of the noble family of that name, by Margaret Douglas of the house of Mains, Dumbartonshire. But more than once in his career he required royal letters of legitimation to enable him to take office, and there is every reason to believe that he was the son of an illicitly married cleric, who was probably identical with the William Elphinstone who was canon of Glasgow from 1451 to 1482, dean of the faculty of arts in Glasgow University in 1468, prebend of Ancrum in 1479, and archdeacon of Teviotdale in 1482, and who died in 1486. The younger Elphinstone was educated in the pedagogie at Glasgow and afterwards at the university. There are several entries in

the registers of the university of his name, which was a common one. Probably he took the M.A. degree on 16 March 1451–2, after which indifferent health compelled him to live for some time quietly at home with his parents. Resuming his studies, he applied himself to the reading of civil and canon law, and practised in the church courts. He was ordained priest and became rector of St. Michael's Church, Trongate, in 1465, and was in the same year a regent of the university. After four years' ministry Elphinstone was persuaded by his uncle, Laurence Elphinstone, who furnished him with the necessary funds, to complete his study of law at the university of Paris. There his attainments were speedily recognised, and he was shortly appointed to the post of 'first reader' in canon law. While in Paris he formed the acquaintance of John de Gaucir, with whom he continued on terms of affectionate intimacy till Gaucir's death. After obtaining the degree of doctor of decrees at Paris, Elphinstone proceeded to Orleans, where he lectured at the university on his special subject. On the advice of Bishop Muirhead of Glasgow he returned home (in 1474 at latest) and was almost immediately chosen rector of the university and, not long afterwards, official of Glasgow. In his judicial capacity he won high esteem, though his sentences did not err on the side of leniency, and in 1478 he was promoted to be official of Lothian and archdeacon of Lismore. He now took his seat in the national parliament and frequently served on judicial committees. In 1479 he was sent on a political mission to Louis XI, which he accomplished so much to the satisfaction of James III that on his return he was made archdeacon of Argyll. In March 1481 he was 'electus confirmatus Rossensis,' but his consecration appears to have been delayed, for he did not sit in parliament as bishop of Ross till the close of the following year, in which he had gone as ambassador from James III to Edward IV, to dissuade the latter from lending assistance to the Duke of Albany. In 1483 he was a privy councillor, and was nominated to the see of Aberdeen, though he was not consecrated till some time between 17 Dec. 1487 and April 1488, probably owing to the difficulty occasioned by his illegitimate birth. He was sent a second time as ambassador to England in 1484, to treat for a truce and to arrange a marriage between James III and Edward IV's niece, Anne; and again after the accession of Henry VII, when he was instrumental in concluding a three years' truce. In the intervals of his journeys Elphinstone was busily employed in Edinburgh, where he was now a lord auditor of complaints, and constantly attended in parliament. He also gave attention to the requirements of his see of Aberdeen, reforming the cathedral services, which had fallen into disuse, and restoring the fabric by covering the whole roof with lead and by the addition of the great steeple at the east end. For this steeple he furnished at his own expense fourteen 'tuneable' bells, which were hung on some adjacent oak trees in such a manner that they could be rung from inside the building. In the struggle between James III and his nobles Elphinstone remained loyal to the king, and in February 1488 he was appointed lord high chancellor, an office which he held only till James's death in the following June, when he retired to Aberdeen. The value of his services, however, was fully appreciated by the young king, and he was summoned to Edinburgh to sit in parliament and resume his duties as lord auditor. His diplomatic talents were especially in request. In 1491 he was one of an embassy which was sent to France to contract a marriage for the king; in October of the following year he was one of the commissioners appointed to treat with the English commissioners at Coldstream for redress of injuries and the extension of the existing truce; and, later, probably in 1493, he was sent on a mission to the Emperor Maximilian to arrange a marriage between the latter's daughter and James IV. On this occasion he arrived only to find the lady already married, but on his way home he concluded a treaty between Scotland and Holland. In 1492 he had been made keeper of the privy seal, a post which he still held in 1509, and probably continued to hold till his death. For the remainder of his life Elphinstone, when not occupied by affairs of state, devoted his chief energies to the foundation and constitution of King's College at Aberdeen. The necessary papal bull was obtained in 1594, and the royal charter erecting old Aberdeen into a city and university was granted in 1498. Under Elphinstone's direction, the king set apart certain tithes and other revenues for the maintenance of the college, the building of which was commenced in 1500 and completed in 1506. In the meantime Elphinstone had obtained the assistance and co-operation of Boece and Hay, the former of whom he appointed first rector of his university. The constitution was modelled on that of the universities of Paris and Bologna, from which it differed, however, in one important principle. Dr. Thomas Reid (*Account of the University of Glasgow*) has pointed out that, 'either from experience of what Elphinstone had observed in Glasgow,

or from a deeper knowledge of human nature, he supplied both the defects of Glasgow, for he gave salaries to those who were to teach theology, canon and civil law, medicine, language, and philosophy, and pensions to a certain number of poor students, and likewise appointed a visitorial power, reserving to himself as chancellor, and to his successors in that office, a dictatorial power.' The soundness of the principles on which Elphinstone founded his university [for further details concerning which see BOECE, HECTOR] was shown in the position it speedily assumed as first in popularity and fame among the Scotch universities. Other public works in Aberdeen due to Elphinstone were the rebuilding of the choir of the cathedral and the erection of a bridge over the Dee, for the completion of which he left a large sum of money. He was also mainly responsible for the introduction of printing into Scotland, obtaining in 1507 a grant of exclusive privileges in favour of Walter Chapman and Andrew Millar of Edinburgh. He personally superintended the production at their press of the 'Breviarium Aberdonense,' some of the lives of saints in which are believed to be of his authorship. Elphinstone was strongly opposed to the hostile policy towards England which culminated in the battle of Flodden, and that event is said to have hastened his end. 'He was never after it seen to smile,' says Boece. He journeyed to Edinburgh to attend the parliament which was summoned in 1514, but he was seized with illness at Dunfermline and died shortly after his arrival in the capital on 25 Oct. 1514. He had been already nominated by the queen for the bishopric of St. Andrews. His body was embalmed and conveyed to Aberdeen, where it was buried in the college beneath the first step of the high altar. That Elphinstone left any literary remains is by no means certain. He collected materials relating to the history of Scotland and particularly of the western isles, but he was not the author of the continuation of the 'Scotichronicon' in the Bodleian Library, which has been attributed to him by biographers from Tanner downwards, but which has been conclusively proved to be the work of Maurice de Buchanan. Another work attributed to him was the 'Lives of Scottish Saints,' and in the library of Aberdeen University are a number of volumes on canon law which bear his name, but there is nothing to show that he was their author rather than possessor. Elphinstone was at once the foremost churchman and statesman of his time in Scotland; his pre-eminence in wisdom, learning, benevolence, and generosity has never been questioned, nor his name mentioned except in terms of high praise.

[The chief authority for Elphinstone's life is the memoir by his friend Boece included in the lives of the Bishops of Mortlach and Aberdeen, which contains, however, not a single date, while the points he fixes by giving the bishop's age are for the most part irreconcilable with other sources of information. These are to be found in the Rolls Series relating to Scotland and in the Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis and Fasti Aberdonenses, both of which are published by the Spalding Club, and contain prefaces by Mr. Cosmo Innes dealing with Elphinstone's career. The preface to Alexander Garden's metrical version of Boece's Life of Elphinstone (published by the Hunterian Club) by Mr. David Laing contains, amid much research, an attempt to reconcile the various discrepancies in the dates, but fixes little, while it unsettles much. Elaborate panegyrics on Elphinstone will be found in the works of Leslie and Spotiswood.] A. V.

ELPHINSTONE, WILLIAM GEORGE KEITH (1782–1842), major-general, was the elder son of the Hon. William Fullarton Elphinstone, a director of the East India Company, and formerly captain of one of the company's ships, who was himself third son of John, tenth lord Elphinstone, and elder brother of Admiral Lord Keith. He entered the army as an ensign in the 41st regiment on 24 March 1804, was promoted lieutenant on 4 Aug. 1804, and captain into the 93rd regiment on 18 June 1806. He exchanged into the 1st, or Grenadier guards, on 6 Aug. 1807, and into the 15th light dragoons on 18 Jan. 1810, and was promoted major into the 8th West India regiment on 2 May 1811. On 30 Sept. 1813 he purchased the lieutenant-colonelcy of the 33rd regiment, with which he served under Sir Thomas Graham in Holland, and which he commanded with such credit at Waterloo that he was made a C.B., a knight of the order of William of Holland, and of the order of St. Anne of Russia. He continued to command this regiment during the occupation of French territory from 1815 to 1818, and in England until 25 April 1822, when he went upon half-pay. On 27 May 1825 Elphinstone was promoted colonel, and appointed aide-de-camp to the king, and on 10 Jan. 1837 he was promoted major-general. In 1839 he was appointed to the command of the Benares division of the Bengal army, and proceeded to India to take up his command. From this peaceful position he was unfortunately selected at the close of 1841 to take command of the British army at Cabul, in succession to Sir Willoughby Cotton. The first part of the first Afghan war of 1839 and 1840 was over; Dost Muhammad was re-

moved from the throne of Afghanistan, and the English nominee, Shah Shujá, was believed to be safely established; the greater part of the army which had accomplished these services was withdrawn from Afghanistan, and only a single division left there to support Shah Shujá and the English resident, Sir William Macnaghten. When Elphinstone took command of the division at Cabul all appeared quiet, and the troops there amused themselves with pony-racing and theatricals, just as if they were in a friendly country. Elphinstone took no trouble to keep his division cantoned in a position of defence, and misled by the political officers, Burnes and Macnaghten, seemed to forget the peril of his position and his distance from any succour from India. His health was also very bad indeed, and he left all matters of military routine to his subordinates. He was utterly unfitted from his age and health to cope with the grave position of affairs which ensued at Cabul on the assassination of Sir William Macnaghten by Akbar Khán on Christmas day, 1841. The Afghans promptly closed all communications between India and Cabul, and even between Jellalabad, where Sale and his gallant brigade had established themselves, and Cabul. The English troops were surrounded and practically besieged. Elphinstone had little to do in this posture of affairs; he was crippled by gout, and left everything to Brigadier-general Shelton to manage. At last, on 23 April 1842, before the final catastrophe, the old general died of dysentery, and his coffin was floated down to Jellalabad, where it was buried. By many he was blamed for incapacity, but it is rather the government of India, which selected him for so important a command in full knowledge of his age, infirmities, and long absence from actual warfare, which deserves the blame.

[Hart's Army List, 1841; Royal Military Calendar; Kaye's War in Afghanistan; Gleig's Sale's Brigade in Afghanistan; Gent. Mag. September 1842.] H. M. S.

ELRINGTON, CHARLES RICHARD (1787–1850), regius professor of divinity in the university of Dublin, elder son of Thomas Elrington, D.D., bishop of Leighlin and Ferns [q. v.], was born in Dublin on 25 March 1787, and was educated at home by a private tutor. Having entered Trinity College, Dublin, 3 Nov. 1800, under the tutorship of the Rev. Dr. Davenport, and having gained all the honours of his class, he was awarded the gold medal in 1805 for distinguished answering at every term examination. In the same year he gained Bishop Law's mathematical premium, and in 1806 the primate's Hebrew prize. He graduated B.A. in 1805, M.A. 1811, B.D. 1816, and D.D. 1820. In 1810 he was elected a fellow of his college, having obtained the Madden premium in the three preceding years. He was ordained a deacon on 28 Oct. 1810, and on 23 Feb. 1812 was admitted to priest's orders. In December 1814 he married Letitia, daughter of David Babington, esq., of Rutland Square, Dublin, by whom, who died in 1827, he had two sons and other issue. In 1819 he was elected Donnellan lecturer in the university, but his lectures have not been published. In 1825 he was appointed by the Irish lord chancellor and other joint-patrons to the vicarage of St. Mark's, Dublin, and held that benefice until 1831. On 31 Jan. 1832 he was collated to the rectory and prebend of Edermine in the diocese of Ferns, which three months later he exchanged for the chancellorship. In 1829 he had resigned his fellowship, and was elected regius professor of divinity. In 1840 he resigned the chancellorship of Ferns upon his collation by the lord primate, on 14 Dec., to the rectory of Loughgilly, in the diocese of Armagh; and on 22 Sept. in the following year, at the earnest desire of the same patron, he removed to the rectory of the union of Armagh. He effected vast improvements in the divinity school, over which he presided for twenty years. He died at Armagh on 18 Jan. 1850, and was buried in St. Mark's churchyard in that city, where there is a brief Latin inscription to his memory.

Elrington took a very active and prominent part in the formation and management of the Church Education Society for Ireland, founded to provide funds to support the parochial schools connected with the church on the withdrawal of the parliamentary grant. Modifications were afterwards introduced into the management of the national schools, which removed, in Elrington's judgment, many of the difficulties which had induced the clergy to stand aloof from the system. In 1847 he retired from his official position in the Church Education Society, and publicly declared that the clergy ought to accept the amended terms offered by the board of national education.

In 1847 Elrington commenced the publication of a collected edition of the works of Archbishop Ussher, to which he prefixed a full biography; but he did not live to complete his undertaking. The last two volumes have been since published, one of them containing a valuable index to the seventeen volumes, by William Reeves, D.D., now lord bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore. With Elrington has perished a great mass of the ecclesiastical history of Ireland during the

last and present centuries. It is to be regretted that the design he formed, in conjunction with Archdeacon Cotton and the Rev. Dr. Todd, of bringing out an enlarged and improved edition of Sir James Ware's 'History of the Irish Bishops,' was not carried into effect before his death. Besides theological contributions to periodicals, he published several sermons and a few pamphlets upon the education question.

[Dublin University Calendars; Todd's Catalogue of Dublin Graduates; Cotton's Fasti Ecclesiæ Hibernicæ, ii. 357, 371, v. 180; Gent. Mag. (1850), new ser. xxxiii. pt. i. 678; Irish Ecclesiastical Journal (1 Feb. 1850), vi. 17; Stephens's Introduction to vol. iii. of the Book of Common Prayer for Ireland, printed for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 1850.] B. H. B.

ELRINGTON, THOMAS (1688–1732), actor, born in 1688 in London, near Golden Square, was apprenticed by his father, who 'had the honour to serve the late Duke of Montagu' (CURLL, *History of the Stage*, p. 150), to a French upholsterer in Covent Garden. His associate, Chetwood [q. v.], tells many stories of the difficulties that beset them in their joint attempts at amateur performances. Through the introduction of Theophilus Keene, an actor of reputation, Elrington seems to have made his way on to the stage. His first appearance took place 2 Dec. 1709 at Drury Lane, as Oroonoko. He subsequently acted Captain Plume in the 'Recruiting Officer,' the Ghost in 'Œdipus,' Cribbage in the 'Fair Quaker,' &c. In the summer he played with Pinkethman at Greenwich, taking characters of importance. During 1710–12 he remained at Drury Lane. In 1712 he was engaged by Joseph Ashbury [q. v.], the manager of the Smock Alley Theatre, Dublin, at which house he appeared, taking from the first leading parts in tragedy and comedy—Timon in Shadwell's alteration of Shakespeare, Colonel Blunt in Sir Robert Howard's 'The Committee, or the Faithful Irishman,' Lord Townly in the 'Provoked Husband,' &c. In 1713 he married the daughter of Ashbury, after whose death he succeeded to the management of the theatre. He obtained also Ashbury's appointments of deputy-master of the revels and steward of the king's inns of court. A post in the Quit-rent Office was also given him, and by Lord Mountjoy he was made 'gunner to the train of artillery,' a post of some emolument, which subsequently he was allowed to sell. Under his management Smock Alley Theatre prospered, and he enjoyed high social and artistic consideration. He made occasional visits to London, playing, 24 Jan. 1715, at Drury Lane, Cassius in 'Julius Cæsar,' appearing subsequently as Torrismond in the 'Spanish Friar,' Hotspur, Orestes, Sylla in 'Caius Marius,' Mithridates, &c., and playing originally Pembroke in Rowe's 'Lady Jane Gray.' On 6 Oct. 1716 he appeared at Lincoln's Inn Fields as Hamlet. Many parts of importance were assigned him. He was the original Charles Courtwell in Bullock's 'Woman is a Riddle,' and Sir Harry Freelove in Taverner's 'Artful Husband.' In 1718 he was, at Drury Lane, the original Ombre in the 'Masquerade' of Charles Johnson, and Busiris in Young's tragedy of that name. After this he appears to have remained in Ireland until 1 Oct. 1728, when, in consequence of the illness of Booth, he reappeared as Varanes in 'Theodosius' at Drury Lane, of which during the following season he was the mainstay. Othello, Cato, Antony, Orestes, are a few of the parts he then took. Handsome offers were made him of a permanent engagement. These he declined, stating that he was so well rewarded in Ireland for his services that no consideration would induce him to leave it. There was not a gentleman's house in Ireland, he affirmed, at which he was not a welcome visitor (DAVIES, *Dramatic Miscellanies*, iii. 473). After his return to Ireland he was seized with illness, while studying with a builder a plan for a new theatre, and died 22 July 1732. He was buried in St. Michan's churchyard, Dublin, near his father-in-law. His last performance was about a month earlier, as Lord Townly, for the benefit of Vanderdank. He was a good, almost a great actor. His style was to some extent founded on that of Verbruggen. In Oroonoko he was unsurpassed. Macklin spoke with rapture of his acting in the scene with Imoinda, saying that Barry himself was not always equally happy in this part. Colley Cibber did Elrington the honour to be jealous of him, never mentioning his name in the 'Apology.' A story is told by Davies (*Dramatic Miscellanies*, iii. 472) of Cibber refusing Elrington the part of Torrismond in the 'Spanish Friar,' and resisting aristocratic pressure which was brought to bear upon him. Elrington, however, played the part so early as 1715, and was often afterwards seen in it. Elrington was well built and proportioned, and had a voice manly, strong, and sweet. The performance in Dublin of Zanga won him the high commendation of Young, who said he had never seen the part so well done. When the London managers preferred him over the head of Mills to the character of Bajazet, Booth said, upon the displeasure of Mills being manifested, that Elrington would make nine such actors as Mills. Victor says, however, that Elrington owned that the

Tamerlane of Booth overpowered him, and that having never felt the force of such an actor he was not aware that it was within the power of a mortal to soar so much above him and shrink him into nothing. Elrington left three sons, two of whom, Joseph and Richard, took to the stage, and a daughter, an actress, who married an actor named Wrightson. In the preface to 'Love and Ambition,' by James Darcy, 8vo, 1732, played at Dublin, mention is made of a Miss Nancy Elrington, probably the same, who played Alzeyda, 'and promised to make the greatest actress that we ever had in Ireland.' After Elrington's death his brother Francis appears to have been one of the managers of Smock Alley Theatre. Elrington's personal character won him high respect. In Dublin and in Ireland generally he was a great favourite.

[Genest's Account of the English Stage; Hitchcock's Irish Stage; Chetwood's General History of the Stage; Victor's History of the Theatres of London and Dublin; Doran's Their Majesties' Servants; Betterton's History of the English Stage (Curll); Isaac Reed's Notitia Dramatica (manuscript).] J. K.

ELRINGTON, THOMAS, D.D. (1760–1835), bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, only child of Richard and Catherine Elrington of Dublin, was born near that city on 18 Dec. 1760. He entered Trinity College, Dublin, on 1 May 1775 as a pensioner, under the tutorship of the Rev. Dr. Drought, and was elected a scholar in 1778, his undergraduate career being brilliant, especially in mathematics. He graduated B.A. in 1780, M.A. in 1785, and B.D. and D.D. in 1795. In 1781 he was elected a fellow of his college. About 1786 he married Charlotte, daughter of the Rev. Plunket Preston, rector of Duntryleague, co. Limerick, and by her had issue Charles Richard Elrington, D.D. [q. v.], and another son and daughters. In 1794 he was the first to hold the office of Donnellan divinity lecturer in the Dublin University, when he delivered a course of sermons on the proof of christianity from the miracles of the New Testament, which were published in 1796. In 1795 he was appointed Archbishop King's lecturer in divinity, and succeeded to a senior fellowship. In 1799 he exchanged Erasmus Smith's professorship of mathematics for that of natural philosophy on the same foundation. On resigning his fellowship in 1806 he was presented by his college to the rectory of Ardtrea, in the diocese of Armagh, which he held until December 1811, when he resigned, having been appointed by the Duke of Richmond, lord-lieutenant of Ireland, by letters patent dated the 15th of the preceding month, to the provostship of Trinity College. During his tenure of this office he was the acting manager of almost every public board, and the generous supporter of numerous charitable institutions. From the provostship he was advanced on 25 Sept. 1820 to the bishopric of Limerick, and on 21 Dec. 1822 he was translated to Leighlin and Ferns. He was an active and useful prelate of the church of Ireland. While on his way to attend his parliamentary duties in London he died of paralysis at Liverpool on 12 July 1835. He was buried under the chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, in which there is a monument with a Latin inscription to his memory. Another monument has been erected by his clergy in the cathedral church of Ferns. The Elrington theological essay prize was instituted in Trinity College in 1837. A portrait of the bishop was painted in 1820 for his brother, Major Elrington, by Thomas Foster, and, having been engraved by William Ward, was published in 1836 by Graves & Co. There is a marble bust in the library of Trinity College.

Elrington was an active member of the Royal Irish Academy, and of other literary and scientific societies. His works are: 1. 'Refutation of the Arguments in Dr. Butler's Letter to Lord Kenmare,' 1787. 2. 'Reply to the Third Section of Mr. O'Leary's Defence,' 1787. 3. 'Thoughts on the Principles of Civil Government, and their Foundation in the Law of Nature, by S. N.' [Thomas Elrington], 1793. 4. 'Enquiry into the Consistency of Dr. Troy's Pastoral Instruction,' 1793. 5. 'Sermons on Miracles, preached at the Donnellan Lecture in Trinity College, Dublin, in 1795; with an Act Sermon for the degree of D.D.,' 1796. 6. 'Sermon on the Death of Matthew Young, D.D., Bishop of Clonfert; with some Anecdotes of his Life' (three editions), 1800. 7. 'The Vindication of Dr. Troy Refuted,' 1804. 8. 'The Clergy of the Church of England truly Ordained, in reply to Ward's Controversy of Ordination; with an Appendix,' 1808. 9. 'Letters on Tythes, first published in the "Dublin Journal"' (two editions), 1808. 10. 'Reflections on the Appointment of Dr. Milner as the Political Agent of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland,' 1809. 11. 'Remarks occasioned by the Supplement and Postscript to the second edition of Dr. Milner's Tour in Ireland,' 1809. 12. 'Letter to the Right Hon. W. W. Pole on the Proposal for a Commutation of Tythes in Ireland,' 1810. 13. 'The Validity of English Ordination Established, in answer to the Rev. P. Gandolphy's Sermon on John x. 1,' 1818. 14. 'Inquiry whether the Disturbances in Ireland have originated

in Tythes,' 1822; second edition, with an Appendix, 1823. 15. 'Observations on J. K. L.'s [Bishop Doyle's] Letter to the Marquess Wellesley; on Tracts and Topics by E. Barton; and on the Letter to Mr. Abercrombie,' 1824. 16. 'Review of the Correspondence between the Earl of Mountcashell and the Bishop of Ferns, with the Letters,' 1830. 17. 'Reply to John Search's [Archbishop Whately's] Considerations on the Law of Libel, as relating to Publications on the subject of Religion,' 1834. Elrington also published separate sermons and charges, and edited, for the use of Trinity College, 'Euclid's Elements, the first Six Books,' 1788 (ten or twelve times reprinted); 'Locke on Government, with Notes,' 1798; and 'Juvenalis et Persius, editio expurgata,' 1808.

[Dublin University Calendars; Todd's Cat. of Dublin Graduates; Cotton's Fasti Eccles. Hibern. i. 391, ii. 344, v. 176; Gent. Mag. (1835), new ser. vol. iv. pt. ii. p. 316; Annual Register (1835), lxxvii. chron. 232; British Mag. (1835–6), viii. 507, ix. 5.] B. H. B.

ELSDALE, ROBINSON (1744–1783), autobiographer, entered the navy as a midshipman, but left early by reason of the slowness of promotion, and served in various privateers cruising against the French, chiefly off the coast of Hispaniola and the west coast of Africa, between 1762 and 1779, when he retired. For the benefit of his wife he wrote an account of some of the most exciting adventures and experiences which he had met with during his sea life. These episodes in a life of adventure are told in a fresh, simple, and lively style, and abound in hair-breadth escapes and romantic incidents. The manuscript fell into the hands of Captain Marryat, and was freely used by him in the earlier chapters of 'Extracts from the Log of a Privateersman One Hundred Years Ago' (1846). After his retirement from active service Elsdale lived quietly on an estate at Surfleet, Lincolnshire, which had been in his family for many generations. He died in 1783. Elsdale married in 1779 Miss Ann Gibbins, a lady of great beauty and intelligence, by whom he had two sons, Samuel and Robinson. Samuel was educated at Lincoln College, Oxford, graduating B.A. in 1803, M.A. 1809, took holy orders and a fellowship, and became the master of the grammar school, Moulton, Lincolnshire, was a frequent contributor to magazines, and the author of a volume of sacred poetry entitled 'Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell; a Poem, with Hymns and other Poems,' 1812, 8vo; 3rd ed. 1813. He died on 13 July 1827.

[Robinson Elsdale's MS. Journal now in the possession of Major Elsdale, R.A., of Woolwich, his great-grandson; Dict. of Living Authors, 1816; information from Major Elsdale; Cal. Oxford Grad.] J. M. R.

ELSTOB, ELIZABETH (1683–1756), Anglo-Saxon scholar, was born on 29 Sept. 1683 in St. Nicholas parish, Newcastle-on-Tyne. She was the sister of William Elstob [q. v.], and it is said (Nichols, *Anecd.* iv. 139) that Dr. Hickes was her grandfather by her mother's side. As Hickes, born 1644, married in 1679, this is impossible. She appears to have been really his niece. She had learnt her 'accidence and grammar' at the age of eight, when her mother died. Her guardian stopped her studies, thinking that one 'tongue was enough for a woman.' She obtained leave, however, to learn French, and upon going to live with her brother at Oxford was encouraged by him to learn eight languages, including Latin. In 1709 she published the 'English-Saxon Homily on the Nativity of St. Gregory,' with an English translation and a preface. The book was printed by subscription and dedicated to Queen Anne. Her portrait is inserted in the initial letter G. Lord Oxford obtained some assistance from the queen in a proposed edition by her of the homilies of Ælfric (*fl.* 1006) [q. v.] Her scheme is advocated in a letter by her to the prebendary Elstob, in 'Some Testimonies of Learned Men in favour of the intended version of the Saxon Homilies.' The original manuscript is in the Lansdowne MSS. No. 458. The printing was actually begun at Oxford, and a fragment of thirty-six pages, presented by Sir Henry Ellis, is in the British Museum. It never reached publication. In 1715 she published 'Rudiments of Grammar for the English-Saxon Tongue, first given in English; with an apology for the Study of Northern Antiquities.' A new set of types was provided for this at the expense of Chief-justice Parker, afterwards Lord Macclesfield (Nichols, *Anecd.* i. 67).

After her brother's death she became dependent on her friends and received some help from Bishop Smalridge. She retired to Evesham in Worcestershire, where she set up a school. After a hard struggle she obtained so many pupils that she had 'scarcely time to eat.' She made the acquaintance of George Ballard [q. v.], then of Campden in Gloucestershire, and of Mrs. Chapone (often called Capon), wife of a clergyman who kept a school at Stanton in the same county. Mrs. Chapone (whose maiden name was Sarah Kirkman) was an intimate friend of Mary Grenville, afterwards Mrs. Pendarves, and finally Mrs. Delaney [q. v.], and mother of John Chapone, husband of Hester Chapone [q. v.]

Miss Elstob was still in difficulties, as her scholars only paid a groat a week, and Mrs. Chapone wrote a circular letter asking for a subscription on her behalf. The subscription produced an annuity of 20*l.*, and Queen Caroline, to whom the letter had been shown through the good offices of Mrs. Pendarves, sent 100*l.*, and promised a similar sum at the end of every five years. The death of Queen Caroline deprived Miss Elstob of any further advantage. Mrs. Pendarves, however, introduced her to the Duchess of Portland, daughter of her old patron, Lord Oxford. She was made governess to the duchess's children in the autumn of 1738, and remained in the same service until her death, 3 June 1756. Her letters to Ballard are preserved in his collection in the Bodleian Library. Ballard speaks of some portraits by her as 'very masterly done' (Nichols, *Illustr.* iv. 213).

[Nichols's Lit. Anecd. iv. 128–40, 714; Nichols's Illustr. iv. 212; Nichols's Bibl. Topogr. Brit. vol. i.; Mrs. Delaney's Autobiography (1st ser.); Thoresby's Diary, ii. 27, 131, 158, 183, 229; Thoresby's Correspondence, ii. 147, 198, 199, 225, 301; Reprints of Rare Tracts, Newcastle, 1847.] L. S.

ELSTOB, WILLIAM (1673–1715), divine, son of Ralph Elstob, merchant of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, was baptised at All Saints' Church, Newcastle, on 1 Jan. 1673 (Richardson, *Reprints*, p. 74). The Elstob family claimed descent from ancient Welsh kings, and had long been settled in the diocese of Durham. Elstob was educated at Newcastle and Eton, whence at the age of sixteen he was sent, by the advice of his uncle and guardian, Charles Elstob, D.D. (prebendary of Canterbury from 1685 to 1721), to Catharine Hall, Cambridge, 'in a station below his birth and fortune.' His health also suffered from the Cambridge air. He therefore entered Queen's College, Oxford, as a commoner. He graduated B.A. in 1694. He was elected fellow of University College on 23 July 1696, and took his M.A. degree on 8 June 1697. Hearne says that having failed of election to All Souls as a south country man, he 'became a northern man,' and was elected one of Skirlaw's fellows at University College (Hearne, *Collections*, Doble, i. 114). In 1702 he was presented by the dean and chapter of Canterbury, presumably through his uncle's influence, to the united parishes of St. Swithin and St. Mary Bothaw, London. Here he died, after a lingering illness, on 3 March 1714–15, and was buried in the chancel of St. Swithin's. He was chaplain to Bishop Nicolson of Carlisle, who in February 1713 applied for Chief-justice Parker's influence for his appointment to the preachership at Lincoln's Inn.

Elstob was an amiable man, a good linguist and antiquary, and especially skilled in Anglo-Saxon. He was a friend, probably a nephew, of the learned nonjuror, Hickes, of Humphrey Wanley, Sir Andrew Fountaine, Strype, and other men of learning. In 1701 he contributed a Latin translation of the homily of Lupus to the 'Dissertatio Epistolaris' in Hickes's 'Thesaurus' (pt. iii. p. 99). Hickes wrote a preface to his 'Essay on the great Affinity and Mutual Agreement of the two professions of Divinity and Law, . . . in vindication of the Clergy's concerning themselves in political matters.' It is a defence of high-church principles. Sir Andrew Fountaine acknowledges Elstob's help in giving descriptions of Saxon coins for the tables published by him in Hickes's 'Thesaurus' (pt. iii. p. 166). Elstob communicated to Strype a copy of Sir John Cheke's 'Discourse upon Plutarch's Treatise on Superstition.' This had been preserved in manuscript in the library of University College, and mutilated by Obadiah Walker. Elstob's version is appended to Strype's 'Life of Cheke.' In 1703 Elstob published a new edition (much enlarged) of Roger Ascham's 'Letters.' In 1709 he contributed a Latin version of the Saxon homily on the nativity of St. Gregory to his sister's edition of the original [see Elstob, Elizabeth], and an Anglo-Saxon book of 'Hours,' with a translation by him, is appended to 'Letters' between Hickes and a popish priest. He made collections for a history of Newcastle and of 'proper names formerly used in northern countries.' He also made proposals for what was to be his great work, a new edition of the Saxon laws already published by Lombarde (1568) and Wheelock (1644), with many additions, comments, prefaces, and glossaries. This design was stopped by his death, and afterwards executed by David Wilkins, 'Leges Anglo-Saxoniæ,' &c. (1721), who mentions Elstob's plan in his preface. Hickes also speaks of this plan in the dedication of his two volumes of posthumous sermons (1726). Elstob prepared a version of Ælfred's 'Orosius,' which finally came into the hands of Daines Barrington [q. v.] He printed a specimen of this at Oxford in 1699 (Nichols, *Lit. Anecd.* iv. 123 *n.*)

He also published two separate sermons in 1704 on the battle of Blenheim and the anniversary of the queen's accession. In Hearne's 'Collections' (by Doble, ii. 107–9) is a mock-heroic poem by Elstob upon the butler of University College.

[Nichols's Lit. Anecd. iv. 112–25. This is founded upon a life by his sister, published by Samuel Pegge in Nichols's Bibl. Topogr. Britan-

nica, vol. i. 1780 (article on history of the Textus Roffensis). It is also abridged in the Archæologia, xxvi., and republished with some additional facts in Reprints of Rare Tracts at the press of M. A. Richardson, Newcastle (1847).]

L. S.

ELSTRACKE, RENOLD (RENIER) (*fl.* 1590–1630), engraver, long accepted as one of the earliest native engravers in England, is usually stated to have been born in London about 1590. It seems, however, almost certain that he was a member of a well-to-do family, resident in the town of Hasselt in Belgium, and he may be possibly identified with a certain Renier, son of Gonthier von Elstracke, known to be living in 1613, but apparently not in his native country. He was in all probability a pupil of Crispin van de Passe the elder at Cologne, and came to England at the same time and under the same circumstances as the younger members of the Van de Passe family [q. v.] His style of engraving has very much in common with that of those artists, and similarly his engravings are more valued for their rarity than for their artistic excellence. They are extremely interesting, as they portray many of the most important persons of the day. His chief production was the set of engravings of the kings of England, published in 1618 by Henry Holland [q. v.], and sold by Compton Holland under the title of 'Basiliologia; a Booke of Kings, beeing the true and lively Effigies of all our English kings from the Conquest untill this present, with their seuerall coats of Armes, Impreses, and Devises! And a briefe Chronologie of their liues and deaths, elegantly grauen in Copper.' This set consists of thirty-two portraits and a title-page containing portraits of James I and Anne of Denmark. This title-page, with different portraits, was used for the Earl of Monmouth's translation of Biondi's 'History of the Civil Wars.' The plates were subsequently used for 'Florus Anglicus, or Lives of the Kings of England,' and again for William Martyn's 'Historie and Lives of the Kings of England.' In both these cases they have letterpress at the back, and are in a very much worn condition. One of the rarest of Elstracke's engravings, and the most highly prized by collectors, is the double whole-length portrait of Mary Queen of Scots and Henry, lord Darnley; an impression of this was sold in 1824 in the collection of Sir Mark Sykes for 81*l.* 18*s.*; the same print was sold at the dispersal of the Stowe Granger . . . in 1849 (when a great number of Elstracke's engravings were disposed of) for 33*l.* 10*s.*, and in March 1884, at the sale of the Dent collection, was purchased for the British Museum at a cost of 150*l.* Among other rare engravings by Elstracke were similar portraits of Frederick V, elector palatine, and Princess Elizabeth (Dent sale, 23*l.*), and James I of England and Anne of Denmark (Dent sale, 65*l.*) A portrait of Sir Richard Whittington was first engraved by Elstracke with the hand resting on a skull, which was subsequently altered to a cat; in its original state it is extremely rare. Among other notabilities whose portraits were engraved by Elstracke were: Gervase Babington, bishop of Worcester, Sir Julius Cæsar, Sir Thomas More, Thomas Sutton, founder of the Charterhouse, Thomas Howard, earl of Suffolk, John, lord Harington of Exton, Robert Devereux, earl of Essex, Robert Carr, earl of Somerset, and his wife, Sir Thomas Overbury, Matthew Hutton, archbishop of York, Tobias Matthew, archbishop of York, and others. He also engraved numerous frontispieces. A print of James I sitting in parliament is dated 1624, and there is a similar print of Charles I ascribed to Elstracke, in which case he must have lived on into the reign of the latter king. It is not known when he died.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Walpole's Anecdotes of Painting, ed. Dallaway and Wornum; Siret's Journal des Beaux-Arts, 1867, 1868; Catalogues of the Sutherland and Morrison collections; sale catalogues mentioned above.]

L. C.

ELSUM, JOHN (*fl.* 1700–1705), was the author of a collection of 'Epigrams upon the Paintings of the most eminent Masters, Antient and Modern, with Reflexions upon the several Schools of Painting, by J. E., Esq.' (8vo, London, 1700). The similarity of initials has caused this work to be sometimes ascribed to John Evelyn [q. v.] Some of the epigrams are translations from Michael Silos's 'De Romana Pictura et Sculptura.' Elsum also published in 1703 'The Art of Painting after the Italian Manner, with Practical Observations on the Principal Colours and Directions how to know a Good Picture;' and in 1704 'A Description of the celebrated pieces of Paintings of the most Antient Masters, in verse.' No details are known of his life.

[Brit. Mus. Cat.; Universal Catalogue of Books on Art.]

L. C.

ELSYNGE, HENRY (1598–1654), clerk of the House of Commons, eldest son of Henry Elsynge, was born at Battersea in 1598, educated at Westminster under L. Osbaldiston, and entered Christ Church, Oxford, as a commoner, 1621, proceeding B.A. 1625. After spending seven years in foreign travel, Archbishop Laud procured him the appoint-

ment of clerk of the House of Commons, where his services were highly valued, especially during the Long parliament. In 1648 he resigned his appointment to avoid taking part in the proceedings against Charles I (Whitelocke, *Memorials*, 1732, p. 364), and retired to Hounslow in Middlesex, where he died, and was buried in St. Margaret's, Westminster, 1654. Elsynge was a man of considerable learning and ability and a good scholar. Whitelocke and Selden were among his friends. His works are: 1. 'Of the Form and Manner of Holding a Parliament in England,' 1663 (apparently derived from a manuscript in eight chapters, of similar scope, written by his father, 1626; the third edition was published in 1675, and a new and enlarged edition, edited by Tyrwhitt, in 1768). 2. 'A Tract concerning Proceedings in Parliament.' 3. 'A Declaration or Remonstrance of the State of the Kingdom,' 1642 (reprinted in Rushworth's 'Historical Collection,' vol. iv., and in E. Husband's 'Remonstrances,' 1643, p. 195). 4. 'Method of Passing Bills in Parliament,' 1685 (reprinted in 'Harleian Miscellany').

[Kippis's Biog. Brit. 1793, v. 586; Wood's Athenæ, ed. Bliss, iii. 363; Wood's Fasti, i. 231; Rushworth's Historical Collection, 1659, vol. iv.; E. Husband's Remonstrances, 1646, p. 195; Watt's Bibl. Brit. 1824, p. 335.] N. D. F. P.

ELTON, Sir CHARLES ABRAHAM (1778–1853), author, only son of the Rev. Sir Abraham Elton, fifth baronet, by Elizabeth, daughter of Sir John Durbin, alderman of Bristol, was born at Bristol on 31 Oct. 1778. He was educated at Eton, and at the age of fifteen received a commission in the 48th regiment, in which he rose to the rank of captain. He served with the 4th regiment in Holland under the Duke of York. He was afterwards lieutenant-colonel of the Somersetshire militia. On the death of his father (23 Feb. 1842) he became sixth baronet. He married in 1804 Sarah, eldest daughter of Joseph Smith, merchant of Bristol, by whom he had five sons and eight daughters. The two eldest sons were drowned in 1819, while bathing near Weston-super-Mare. The third, Arthur Hallam (*b.* 19 April 1818), succeeded to the baronetcy, and died 14 Oct. 1883. His seventh daughter, Mary Elizabeth, married her cousin, Frederick Bayard, fourth son of the fifth baronet, and was mother of the present Charles Isaac Elton, M.P., and author of 'Origins of English History' (Foster, *Peerage*). The eighth daughter, Jane Octavia, married W. H. Brookfield [q. v.] Elton's sister, Julia Maria, married Henry Hallam the historian. Elton was a man of cultivated tastes. He was a strong whig, and spoke at the Westminster hustings on behalf of Romilly and Hobhouse; but latterly he lived much in retirement at his house, Clevedon Court. He died at Bath on 1 June 1853.

He published: 1. 'Poems,' 1804. 2. 'Remains of Hesiod, translated into English verse.' 3. 'Tales of Romance, and other Poems, including selections from Propertius,' 1810. 4. 'Specimens of the Classical Poets in a chronological series from Homer to Tryphiodorus, translated into English verse,' 1814 (with critical observations prefixed to each specimen; reviewed in the 'Quarterly Review,' xiii. 151–8). 5. 'Remains of Hesiod, translated ... with notes,' 1815 ('by C. A. E.') 6. 'Appeal to Scripture and Tradition in Defence of the Unitarian Faith' (anon.), 1818. 7. 'The Brothers, a Monody [referring to the death of his sons], and other Poems,' 1820. 8. 'History of Roman Emperors,' 1825. 9. 'Δεύτεραι Φροντίδες. Second Thoughts on the Person of Christ ... containing reasons for the Author's Secession from the Unitarian Communion and his adherence to that of the Established Church,' 1827.

[Gent. Mag. 1853, ii. 88, 89; Foster's and Burke's Baronetages.]

ELTON, EDWARD WILLIAM (1794–1843), actor, was born in London, in the parish of Lambeth, in August 1794, and was trained for the law in the office of a solicitor named Springhall in Verulam Buildings, Gray's Inn. His father, whose name was Elt, was a schoolmaster in the neighbourhood of Tottenham Court Road, and got up plays among his scholars. In these, at the Sans Souci Theatre in Leicester Place, and subsequently at Pym's private theatre, Wilson Street, Gray's Inn Lane, Elton acted as a youth. After joining a strolling company, he appeared, 1823, as utility actor at the Olympic, playing in 'A Fish out of Water,' where he made the acquaintance of Tyrone Power. At Christmas he went to the Liverpool Amphitheatre, where the following year, after a summer engagement at Birmingham, under Alfred Bunn [q. v.], he played Napoleon in the spectacle of the 'Battle of Waterloo.' He then, at the Theatre Royal, Liverpool, played Cominius in 'Coriolanus.' After starring in Chester, Worcester, Shrewsbury, and elsewhere, he attracted in Manchester the favourable notice of Charles Young, with whom he appeared in Norwich and Cambridge. His efforts in Shakespearean parts were not very successful. With a fair country reputation, however, he came in 1831 to the Garrick Theatre in Whitechapel, opening under Conquest and Wynn in Richard III.

Great popularity attended him at the east end. In October 1832 he was at the Strand Theatre, whence he went to the Surrey. An unsuccessful engagement at the Haymarket, under Morris, in 1833 came to a speedy termination. He then returned to the minor theatres, was in the spring of 1836 at the Adelphi, and 19 Jan. 1837 at Covent Garden, under Osbaldiston's management, made a success as Walter Tyrrell in the drama so named. On the production, 26 June 1837, at the Haymarket of 'The Bridal,' adapted by Sheridan Knowles from the 'Maid's Tragedy' of Beaumont and Fletcher, he gained much credit as Amintor. He was then engaged for Covent Garden, at which house he was the original Beauseant in the 'Lady of Lyons.' At Drury Lane, 1839–40, he played Romeo and Rolla, and was the original Rizzio in Haynes's 'Mary Stuart.' He then retired to the minor theatres, and in 1841–2 returned with Macready to Drury Lane. The theatre closed 14 June 1843. Before the termination of the season he accepted an engagement of a month from W. Murray of the Edinburgh Theatre. Returning thence to London on board the Pegasus, he was drowned, the ship having struck on a rock near Holy Island and gone down. A strong sensation was caused by his death, and benefits for his children, to which liberal subscriptions were sent, took place at many theatres. The chair at a preliminary meeting in London for the purpose was taken by Charles Dickens. Elton was unfortunate in marriage, having been separated from his first wife, and the second wife, a Miss Pratt, the mother of five of his seven children, going mad. In addition to the characters mentioned, Elton was good as Edgar in 'Lear.' He was the original Eugene Aram, Thierry, and Waller in the 'Love Chase' of Sheridan Knowles. Elton contributed a little to periodical literature, and gave lectures on the drama at the National Hall (now the Royal Music Hall), Holborn. He was one of the original promoters of the General Theatrical Fund Association.

[Marshall's Lives of the Most Celebrated Actors and Actresses, no date (1847); Macready's Reminiscences; Era, 30 July 1843; Era Almanack; Memoir of Henry Compton, by his son, 1879; The Owl, 30 July 1831, in which is a coarse portrait of Elton as Sir Giles Overreach.] J. K.

ELTON, JAMES FREDERIC (1840–1877), African explorer, born 3 Aug. 1840, was the second son of Lieutenant-colonel Roberts W. Elton of the 59th regiment, Bengal army, and grandson of Jacob Elton of Dedham, Essex. When the Indian mutiny broke out he entered the Bengal army and saw much active service. Having been with the relieving armies at Delhi and Lucknow he was placed on the staff of the commander-in-chief, Sir Hugh Rose (Lord Strathnairn), to whom he was aide-de-camp for some years. His services obtained for him the Indian medal with two clasps. In 1860 he volunteered for service in China, and was present at the taking of Pekin and other engagements, receiving the China medal after the campaign. Soon after gaining his captaincy (98th regiment), he left the English service, and in 1866 joined the staff of the French army in Mexico during the 'reign' of the Emperor Maximilian. On his return to England at the conclusion of the war, he published a graphic account of his adventures, entitled 'With the French in Mexico,' 8vo, London, 1867. In 1868 he went to Natal, and occupied himself in travelling about the colony until 1870, when he undertook a long journey of exploration from the Tati gold district down to the mouth of the Limpopo, his narrative of which, accompanied by an excellent map, was published in vol. xlii. of the 'Journal' of the Royal Geographical Society. In 1871 he was sent to make reports on the gold and diamond fields, and was also employed on a diplomatic mission to settle differences with the Portuguese authorities. In 1872 he was appointed government agent on the Zulu frontier. After some months he returned to Natal to recover from a severe attack of fever caused by incessant toil and exposure. While at Natal, he acted as protector of the immigrant native labourers, and became a member of the executive and legislative councils. Desirous of engaging in more active work, in 1873 he left Natal entrusted with various important missions: one of which was to treat with the governor-general of Mozambique and the sultan of Zanzibar, regarding the laying down of a telegraph cable from Aden; the second, to inquire into the emigration of native labour from Delagoa Bay and to confer with the governor-general of Mozambique; and the third, to meet Sir Bartle Frere at Zanzibar, and assist in considering the slave-trade question. During the same year he was appointed by Sir Bartle Frere assistant political agent and vice-consul at Zanzibar, with a view to assist Dr. Kirk in the suppression of the East African slave-trade. While occupying this post he made an interesting journey along the coast country between Dar-es-Salaam and Quiloa, or Kilwa, an account of which, enriched with observations on the products of the country, was published, with a map supplied by him, in vol. xliv. of the 'Journal' of the Royal Geographical Society. In March 1875 he was promoted to the office

of British consul in Portuguese territory, with residence at Mozambique. He was here engaged in many expeditions for the suppression of the slave-trade from this and other parts of the east coast, in the course of which he made numerous journeys by sea and land, to the south as far as Delagoa Bay, and over the Indian Ocean to the Seychelle Islands and Madagascar.

Early in 1877 he started from Mozambique on an expedition to the west and north-west, into the heart of the Makua country, returning to the coast at Mwendazi or Memba Bay; thence he went northward, a journey of four hundred and fifty miles on foot, through the curious craggy peaks of Sorisa, and up the Lurio, to the Sugarloaf Hills and cataracts of Pomba, descending again to Ibo. He also visited all the Kerimba Islands, and explored the coast up to the limit of the Zanzibar mainland territory, beyond the Bay of Tongue, which occupied him three months. In July of the same year Elton left Mozambique for the Zambesi and the Shiré rivers, his intention being to visit the British mission stations on Lake Nyassa, explore the lake and surrounding country, visit various chiefs connected with the slave-trade, and ascertain the possibility of a route from the north end of the lake to Quiloa, at which seaport he proposed to embark in a steamer for Zanzibar, hoping to reach the latter place in November or early in December. His mission to the chiefs and the circumnavigation of the lake were successfully accomplished, but with the land journey troubles began; 'the country was devastated by wars among the different tribes, porterage and food were often unobtainable, and instead of taking a direct route to the east Elton was compelled to travel by a very circuitous one to the north.' He struggled on, 'full of hope, energetic to the last,' till within a few miles of the town of Usekhe in Ugogo, on the caravan-route between the coast opposite Zanzibar and Unyanyembe, when he sank from malarious fever, brought on by exposure and privation. He died 19 Dec. 1877, aged 37, and was buried about two miles from his last camp, under a large baobab tree which overlooks the plains of Usekhe. His four companions, Messrs. Cotterill, Rhodes, Hoste, and Downie, marked the spot by a large wooden cross, and carved his initials on the tree which overshadows his grave.

Elton was a man of remarkable personal energy, courage, and perseverance, and was much endeared to all those who knew him by the frankness, kindness, and modesty of his behaviour. He was, moreover, a clever artist; his maps and sketches of scenery and people made during his expeditions are admirable. His journals were edited and completed by Mr. H. B. Cotterill under the title of 'Travels and Researches among the Lakes and Mountains of Eastern and Central Africa. . . . With maps and illustrations' [and a preface, by Horace Waller, containing a brief memoir of J. F. Elton], 8vo, London, 1879. A portrait accompanies the work.

[Sir R. Alcock's Anniversary Address, 27 May 1878, in Proceedings of Royal Geographical Society, xxii. 306–8, also pp. 248–51, and passim; Waller's Preface to Travels; Annual Register (1878), cxx. 141–2; Sanders's Celebrities of the Century, p. 393.] G. G.

ELTON, RICHARD (*fl.* 1650), military writer, was a native of Bristol. He joined the militia of the city of London, and in 1649 had risen to the rank of major. In 1654 he was deputy-governor of Hull under the parliament, and two years later, being then lieutenant-colonel, he was governor-general. His son, Ensign Richard Elton, held some post under him. A large quantity of official correspondence between Elton and the admiralty is preserved among the state papers. Elton was the author of 'The compleat Body of the Art Military, exactly compiled and gradually composed for the foot in the best refined manner, according to the practise of modern times; divided into three books, the first containing the postures of the pike and musket with their conformities and the dignities of Ranks and Files . . .; the second comprehending twelve exercises; the third setting forth the drawing up and exercising of Regiments after the manner of private companies . . ., together with the duties of all private souldiers and officers in a Regiment, from a Sentinell to a Collonel . . .; illustrated with a varietie of Figures of Battail very profitable and delightfull for all noble and heroic spirits, in a fuller manner than have been heretofore published.—By Richard Elton, Serjeant-Major,' London, 1650, fol. The volume is dedicated to Fairfax, and contains a number of laudatory pieces of verse addressed to Elton by his brother officers. Prefixed is a portrait of the author, engraved by Droeshout. A second edition, with some trifling additions, was published in 1659, at which time Elton was still living.

[Cal. State Papers (Dom. Ser.), 1653–4, 1654, 1657, 1657–8.] A. V.

ELVEY, STEPHEN (1805–1860), organist and composer, was the elder brother and for some time the musical instructor of Sir George Elvey. Stephen was born in June 1805, at Canterbury, and received his training as chorister of the cathedral under

Highmore Skeats. In 1830 he succeeded Bennett as organist of New College, Oxford, and won repute for his skilful playing. He became Mus. Bac. Oxon. 1831, and Mus. Doc. 1838. He was organist of St. Mary's (University) Church, and from 1846 organist of St. John's College. While Dr. Crotch held simultaneously the offices of professor of music and choragus at Oxford, Elvey acted as his deputy in all professorial matters for some years before Crotch died at the end of 1847. In 1848 the offices were divided, Sir Henry Bishop becoming professor, and Dr. Elvey choragus. He retained his appointments until his death, October 1860, at the age of fifty-five.

Elvey made a few but not unimportant contributions to sacred music. The well-known 'Evening Service in continuation of Croft's Morning Service in A,' since re-edited by Dr. Martin, dates from about 1825, when Elvey was lay-clerk at Canterbury Cathedral. The 'Oxford Psalm Book,' 1852, containing six original tunes, was inspired by the 'increasing attention to music shown by the congregational character of the singing before university sermons,' and 'The Psalter, or Canticles and Psalms of David, Pointed for Chanting upon a New Principle,' 1856, followed by 'The Canticles,' 1858, have gone through many editions. The author's earnest care and tact in these compilations helped to effect improvement in the conduct of the services of the established church.

[Stephen Elvey's Musical Works, mentioned above; Oxford Calendars: Alumni Oxonienses; Gent. Mag., 1860, ccix. 557; Jackson's Oxford Journal, 12 Feb. 1848; Grove's Dict. of Music, i. 487.] L. M. M.

ELVIDEN, EDMUND (*fl.* 1570), poet, was the author of three poetical works of extreme rarity: 1. 'A Neweyere's gift to the Rebellious Persons in the North partes of England; primo Januar. 1570,' sm. 8vo, black letter, pp. 20, 'printed at London in Powles Churchyard, at the signe of Love and Death, by Richard Watkins.' 2. 'The Closit of Counsells, conteining the advyse of Divers Wyse Philosophers touchinge sundrye morall matters in Poesies, Preceptes, Prouerbes, and Parables, translated and collected out of divers aucthours into English verse,' 1569, 8vo, London. 3. 'The most excellent and pleasant Metaphoricall History of Pesistratus and Catanea,' 8vo, London, n.d. The only known copy of the latter work, which is quoted by Todd in his edition of Milton, is in the library of the Earl of Ellesmere; the British Museum possesses none of the three books. Of Elviden's personal history nothing is known. From the closing lines of his 'Neweyere's Gift,'

> This wrote your frende, a wyshynge frende
> Unto his natyve soil,

it would seem that he was a north-countryman.

[Corser's Collect. Anglo-Poet. pt. vi. p. 341; Lowndes's Bibliograph. Man.] A. V.

ELWALL, EDWARD (1676–1744), sabbatarian, born at Ettingshall, a hamlet in the parish of Sedgley, Staffordshire, was baptised on 9 Nov. 1676, his parents being Thomas and Elizabeth Elwall. According to his own account his ancestors had been settled in Wolverhampton 'above 1,100 years.' Marrying in his twenty-third year, he went into business in Wolverhampton as a mercer and grocer. Dr. Johnson calls him an ironmonger. He frequented the Bristol and Chester fairs, became popular as an honest tradesman, and made 'an easy fortune.' Out of his gains he built a block of eighteen houses, half a mile from Wolverhampton, in the Dudley Road, known as Elwall's Buildings, and taken down about 1846. Elwall and his wife were presbyterians; he gives a graphic description of the attack on the presbyterian meeting-house at Wolverhampton by a high church mob in 1715. He headed a party of seven or eight who defended the building from being pulled down. The rabble threatened his house, but his wife threw money from the window, and the marauders were content with drinking the health of James III on his doorstep. As he rode down Bilston Street he was fired at, from political rather than personal ill-will; at the coffee-house and town meetings he had been a prominent supporter of Hanoverian politics.

His visits to Bristol seem to have brought about his first religious change. A baptist minister immersed him and his wife in the Severn. He did not then cease attending the presbyterian congregation (of which his wife was always a member). One John Hays of Stafford 'put notions about the Trinity' into his head, and he became a unitarian. John Stubbs, the presbyterian minister at Wolverhampton, preached against him, and Elwall became, according to his wife's account, 'a churchman.' He wrote six letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Wake), and received four in reply, without being convinced on the subject of the Trinity. He was probably drawn towards the quakers through sympathy with Penn's views on this topic; he adopted some of their modes of thought and peculiar turns of expression. But his scripture studies led him to a close if

unconscious reproduction of Ebionite views. Holding the perpetual obligation of the Jewish sabbath, he closed his shop on Saturday and opened it on Sunday. He discarded his wig, grew long hair and a flowing beard. This he followed up with some eccentricities of dress, wearing a blue mantle in the form of 'a Turkish habit, out of respect to the unitarian faith of the Mahometans;' his daughter showed John Byrom [q. v.] 'a cap or turbant,' which he had 'got made from Josephus, and intended to wear instead of a hat.' The dates of his successive stages of opinion are not very clear, but that of his last change is fixed by the following entry in the church book of the sabbatarian baptists at Mill Yard, Goodman's Fields, London: 'December the 6th, 1719 . . . one Mr. Elwaar of Woolverhampton in Staffordshire, being newly come to the observation of the seventh day Sabbath, and having kept Sabbath with us two Sabbath days, and being desirous to commune with us at the Lord's Supper next Sabbath day, Bro^r Savage and Bro^r Mallory are desired to inquire of Mr. Hollis and Mr. Dennis concerning him, and himselfe, and to report next Sabbath.' On 1 May 1720 'Mr. Ellwall' was admitted 'as a transient member.'

At length in 1724 he published his 'True Testimony,' which led to a local controversy, ridiculed by Dr. Johnson (who 'had the honour of dining' in Elwall's company), and eventually to a prosecution for blasphemy at the instance of some clergymen. We find him in London in 1726. In the 'postscript' to the third edition of his second 'Testimony' he describes a lively scene at Pinners' Hall, where, after a sermon by Dr. Samuel Wright, he wished to address the congregation in quaker fashion.

Of his trial in 1726, at the summer assize in Stafford, we have only his own narrative, which is not very clear. His wife told Byrom that before the trial she wrote to Baron Lechmere, who wrote to the judge (Alexander Denton). The case did not go to the jury, and was probably quashed on the ground that Elwall had not been served with a copy of the indictment, which he describes as 'near as big as half a door.' John Martin, who was present at the trial, told Priestley in 1788 that the figure of Elwall, 'a tall man, with white hair' (though he was only in his fiftieth year), 'struck everybody with respect.' Denton proposed to defer the case to the next assize if Elwall would give bail for his appearance. This he refused to do, and asked to be permitted to plead to the indictment in person. Denton allowed him to enter on a long and enthusiastic argument in defence of 'the unitarian doctrine,' at the close of which Rupert Humpatch, a justice who had been his next-door neighbour for three years, spoke to the judge on behalf of his honesty of character. The testimony was corroborated by another justice. Some sensation arose in court when Elwall stated, in reply to a suggestion of the judge, that already he had opened his mind to the head of the hierarchy. After consulting the prosecutors, and making a fruitless attempt to get Elwall to promise to write no more, Denton discharged him.

After the trial Elwall appears to have moved from Wolverhampton to Stafford. It was to Stafford that Byrom, who had met Elwall at Chester, went on 3 Feb. 1729 to find him. Elwall was then at Bristol fair, but Byrom visited his family, and breakfasted with them next day. They told him that a club of deists, who met at an inn, and called themselves Seekers, had endeavoured to get Elwall to join them. His business, Byrom learned, was declining.

Soon afterwards he removed to London, where two of his daughters were married. In 1734 he was living in Ely Court, Holborn. Byrom met him (23 May 1736) in King Street, wearing 'his blue mantle.' In 1738-43 he was living 'against the Bell Inn, Wood Street.' He published several tracts in favour of his views, and in defence of liberty of conscience. With Chubb, whom he treated as a brother unitarian, he had a controversy on the sabbath question. Fletcher of Madeley speaks of him as 'a Socinian quaker,' but he never joined the Society of Friends, and usually worshipped at Mill Yard. He died in London in 1744, and was buried on 29 Nov. in the graveyard at Mill Yard. His son, Sion, who appears to have been his agent in the importation of Russia cloth, married (between 1729 and 1736) the widow of an admiral 'in Muscovy.' Of his daughters, Anne, the eldest, married (1729) Street, of the Temple, a deist; another, Lydia, is described by Byrom (1729) as 'an intolerable talking girl;' a third, Catherine, married (before 1726) Clark, a shopman at the Golden Key on London Bridge.

Elwall's tracts, which are now very scarce, found admirers in America. His name was resuscitated by Priestley, who reprinted the trial from a copy lent him by a quaker at Leeds, and it became a stock tract with the unitarians. Fletcher of Madeley intended to answer it.

He published: 1. 'A True Testimony for God . . . against all the Trinitarians under Heaven,' &c., Wolverhampton and London, 12mo, n. d. (dedication dated 'Wolverhampton, 8 day 2d month [i.e. April], 1724'). 2. 'A True Testimony for God . . . Defence of the

Fourth Commandment of God in Answer to a Treatise entitled The Religious Observation of the Lord's Day,' &c., 1724, 12mo (not seen; see *Notes and Queries*, 6th ser. iv. 51; the treatise (by Dr. S. Wright) to which Elwall replies was first published in 1724, according to Cox); 3rd edition 1627 [i.e. 1726], 12mo, was printed in London and not published, but sold by his daughters. 3. 'A Reply to James Barter's Reflections,' &c., Wolverhampton, 8vo, n. d. [1725] (Barter was a miller and ex-baptist preacher). 4. 'Dagon fallen before the Ark . . . Answer to James Barter's last book,' &c., Wolverhampton, 12mo, n. d. [1725]. 5. 'Dagon fallen upon his Stumps,' &c., Wolverhampton, 12mo, 1726. 6. 'A Declaration against all the Kings and Temporal Powers under Heaven,' &c., 12mo, 1732; 3rd edition, 12mo, 1734; 4th edition, 12mo, 1741 (a plea for freedom of conscience; from this Johnson quoted, altering 'blackcoats' into 'blackguards;' Elwall's challenge to George II to meet him in 'James's Park' for a discussion; the 3rd edition has appended 'The Case of the Seventh-Day Sabbath-Keepers . . . to be laid before the Parliament,' a reprint of part of No. 3, and 'The Vanity . . . of expecting . . . Jews should ever be brought over to the pretended Christian Religion,' &c.; the 4th edition has the account of his trial). 7. 'A Declaration for all the Kings and Temporal Powers under Heaven,' &c., 12mo, 1734 (against rebellion; has appended 'The Vanity,' &c.) 8. 'The Grand Question in Religion . . . With an Account of the Author's Tryal,' &c., 12mo, n. d. (dated 1736 in Elwall's own corrected copy, in Dr. Williams's library; at end is a 'Hymn for the Sabbath-Day'). The narrative of the trial (pp. 51–61) was reprinted separately as 'The Triumph of Truth,' 1738, and subsequently; Priestley re-edited it in 1772, and again in 1788; it has been frequently reprinted in England and America. An argumentative addendum has been attributed to Priestley, but it is Elwall's own, though it does not appear in his earliest or latest issues. 9. 'The True and Sure Way to remove Hirelings . . . With an Answer to . . . Chubb's Dissertation, concerning the . . . Sabbath . . . And a Short Remark on Daniel Dobel's late book,' &c., 12mo, 1738. 10. 'The Supernatural Incarnation of Jesus Christ proved to be false,' &c., 12mo, 1742; 2nd edition, 12mo, 1743. 11. 'Idolatry Discovered and Detected,' 12mo, 1744 (has appended account of the trial).

Aspland wrongly ascribes to Elwall 'Sermon prêché dans la grande assemblée des Quakers de Londres, par le fameux E. Elwall, dit l'Inspiré. Traduit de l'Anglois,' 12mo, Lond. 1737. The British Museum Catalogue assigns it to Alberto Radicati, count di Passerano.

[Elwall's Works; Priestley's edition of Triumph of Truth, 1788 (pref. and appendix), Horncastle edition, 1813 (pref.); Memoir of J. T. [Joshua Toulmin] in Universal Theol. Mag. June 1804, p. 283 sq. (manuscript additions by Theophilus Lindsey Peak); reprint of Memoir, Bilston, 1808; Rutt's Mem. of Priestley, 1831, i. 163; Byrom's Private Journal (Chetham Soc.), 1855, vol. i. pt. ii. pp. 321 sq. 1856, vol. ii. pt. i. pp. 49 sq.; Some Account (by R. B. Aspland) in Christian Reformer, June 1855, pp. 329 sq.; Cox's Literature of the Sabb. Question, 1865; Tyerman's Life of Fletcher, 1882, pp. 218 sq.; Boswell's Johnson (Hill), ii. 164, 251; extract from baptismal register at Sedgley, per the Rev. T. G. Swindell; information from Mr. Elliott, Free Library, Wolverhampton; extracts from church book and burial register of the seventh-day baptists, formerly meeting at Mill Yard, per the Rev. Dr. W. Mead Jones.]

A. G.

ELWES, Sir Gervase (*d.* 1615), lieutenant of the Tower. [See Helwys.]

ELWES or Meggott, John (1714–1789), miser, was born on 7 April 1714 in the parish of St. James, Westminster. His father, Robert Meggott (or Meggot), was a brewer in Southwark, son of George Meggott, M.P. for Southwark (1722–3), grandson of Sir George Meggott, and great-grandson of Dean Meggott (or Megget) of Winchester. Meggott, who had bought an estate at Marcham, Berkshire, married (21 May 1713) Ann or Amy, daughter of Gervase Elwes, and had one son, John (who, by will, took in 1750 the name and arms of Elwes), and a daughter, married to John Timms. Elwes was only four years old when his father died; from his mother he inherited his penurious disposition, for, though she had nearly 100,000*l.* by her husband, she is said to have starved herself to death. Elwes was at Westminster School for ten or twelve years, and became a good classical scholar, but in after life he was never seen to read any book; he had no knowledge of accounts. In his youth he spent two or three years at Geneva, and learned riding, becoming one of the best and most daring riders in Europe. He was introduced to Voltaire, whom he resembled in looks.

On his return he was introduced to his uncle, Sir Hervey Elwes of Stoke College, near Clare, Suffolk, a greater miser than himself. Sir Hervey, the second baronet, had succeeded his grandfather, Sir Gervase, and found an encumbered estate, nominally of considerable value, but producing only

100*l.* a year. He cleared the estate, and gathered money. As he spent no more than 110*l.* a year, he was worth 250,000*l.* at his death. His one amusement was partridge-setting, and he lived on partridges. He kept his money about his house, and was often robbed; on one occasion of 2,750 guineas. But he would take no step to pursue the thieves, remarking 'I have lost my money, and now you want me to lose my time.' In spite of a consumptive habit, he lived to be over eighty. Elwes fell in with his uncle's humour, and used to dress up in old clothes at a little inn in Chelmsford before visiting him. Having a large appetite, he took the precaution of dining with a neighbour before sitting down to his uncle's table. He was rewarded by receiving the inheritance of his uncle's estate at his death on 22 Oct. 1763.

Under his uncle's influence the habits of Elwes deteriorated, till his name has become a byword for sordid penury. But his characteristic was a diseased disinclination to spend money on his personal wants rather than a grasping avarice. He would wear for a fortnight a wig which he had picked from a rut in a lane, and would never have his shoes cleaned lest it should help to wear them out. Yet he kept good horses and a pack of foxhounds, and had them well cared for. He allowed the rain to drop through the roof of his own house at Marcham; but he was not a hard landlord. He inherited property in London about the Haymarket, and built Portland Place and Portman Square and a great part of Marylebone, living while in town in his unlet houses, with an old woman to attend upon him. At the tables of his friends he is said to have been a connoisseur of wines and French cookery. A theatre he never entered. He threw away money at cards; he was a member of Arthur's, and played deep, on one occasion keeping his place at the card-table for two days and a night without intermission. He lost 150,000*l.* in speculations, his latest unsuccessful venture being a project of ironworks in America, which cost him 25,000*l.*

In 1774 Elwes was put forward as member for Berkshire by Lord Craven. He sat in three successive parliaments till 1787. For his elections he paid nothing; but he was ready to lend money to members of parliament, and thus parted with considerable sums which were never repaid. It was expected that he would join the opposition under Fox, but he acted as a 'parliamentary coquette,' sitting indiscriminately on either side of the house, in which he never spoke. Of Pitt, who was not in public life when he entered parliament, Elwes formed the opinion that he was the minister 'for the property of the country,' characteristically remarking, 'In all he says there is pounds, shillings, and pence.'

It is said that Elwes never spared personal trouble to do a kindness. A story is told of his travelling to town and back to extricate two old ladies from a legal embarrassment. They wanted to make good his expenses, when a friend rather cynically observed, 'Send him sixpence, and he gains twopence by the journey.' He loved his boys, but would not educate them, on the novel principle that 'putting things into people's heads is the sure way to take money out of their pockets.' Of his humour it is said that, having cut his legs against the pole of a sedan-chair, he would put but one of them under professional care. 'I'll take one leg and you the other;' he beat the apothecary by a fortnight. An unskilful marksman at a shooting party lodged a couple of pellets in Elwes's cheek. 'My dear sir,' he exclaimed, 'I give you joy of your improvement; I knew you would hit something by and by.'

In later life his memory declined; he fancied he should die in want; he thought of marrying a maid-servant. His son George got him down to Marcham from London in 1789. His memory was then completely gone. He died on 26 Nov. 1789. His will, dated 6 Aug. 1786, disposed of property worth about 500,000*l.* The Stoke College estate went to his grandnephew, John Timms, who took in 1793 the name and arms of Hervey-Elwes, and rose in the army to the rank of lieutenant-general. Elwes never married, but by Elizabeth Moren, his housekeeper at Marcham, he had two sons: George, who got the Marcham estate, married a lady named Alt, and had one daughter, Emily, who made a runaway match with Thomas Duffield, said to have been originally a clergyman, and afterwards M.P. for Abingdon; and John, a lieutenant in the horse guards (*d.* 10 April 1817), who bought the estate of Colesbourne, Gloucestershire, married, and had two children.

[Life by Major Edward Topham, 1790 (British Museum copy has manuscript additions to the pedigree), 12th ed. enlarged, 1805 (this life originally appeared in twelve successive numbers of a paper called The World); Gent. Mag. 1789, p. 1149, 1793, p. 166; Notes and Queries, 4th ser. ix. 85, xii. 494 (corrections of errors in Hawthorne's English Note-book), 5th ser. iv. 520, xii. 237, 6th ser. i. 124, xi. 68, 177; Burke's Landed Gentry, 1863, p. 439; extract from baptismal register of St. James's, Westminster.]

A. G.

ELY, HUMPHREY, LL.D. (*d.* 1604), catholic divine, brother of William Ely [q. v.], president of St. John's College, Oxford, was a native of Herefordshire. After studying for some time at Brasenose College, Oxford, he was elected a scholar of St. John's College in 1566, but on account of his attachment to the catholic faith he left the university without a degree, and proceeding to the English college at Douay was there made a licentiate in the canon and civil laws. He appears to have been subsequently created LL.D. In July 1577 he and other students of law formed a community in the town of Douay, and resided together in a hired house (*Douay Diaries*, p. 125). This establishment was soon broken up by the troubles attributed to the machinations of the queen of England's emissaries, who had probably excited the passions of the Calvinist faction. Ely was hooted as a traitor in the streets of Douay, and the members of his community and of the English college were subjected to frequent domiciliary visits which satisfied the municipal authorities but not the populace. In consequence Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Allen found it necessary to remove the college from Douay to Rheims in 1578. After studying divinity at Rheims Ely accompanied Allen to Rome in August 1579, when the dissensions had occurred in the English college there, but he returned with him to Rheims in the following spring. During his stay in Rome Allen employed him in revising several controversial books (Knox, *Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen*, hist. introd. p. lii seq.; *Douay Diaries*, pp. 130, 136).

In June 1580 he paid a visit to England, disguised as a merchant, travelling under the name of Havard or Howard. There sailed in the same vessel with him three priests, Edward Rishton, Thomas Cottam [q. v.], and John Hart. On their landing at Dover the searchers arrested Cottam and Hart, and the mayor, supposing that Ely was a military man, requested him to convey Cottam to London, and hand him over to Lord Cobham, governor of the Cinque ports. When they were out of the town, Ely allowed his prisoner to go at large, but Cottam, entertaining scruples about the danger which his friend might incur, insisted upon delivering himself up, and was afterwards executed. Ely was committed to prison, but soon obtained his release, probably on account of his not being a priest (Foley, *Records*, ii. 150 seq.) On 23 April 1581 he arrived at Rheims, out of Spain, and in the following month visited Paris, in company with Allen. He was ordained subdeacon at Laon on 8 March 1581–2, deacon at Châlons-sur-Marne on the 31st of the same month, and priest on 14 April 1582. On 22 July 1586 he left Rheims for Pont-à-Mousson, where he had been appointed by the Duke of Lorraine to the professorship of the canon and civil laws, and he occupied that chair till his death on 15 March 1603–4. He was buried in the church of the nuns of the order of St. Clare.

Dodd says Ely 'was a person of great candour and remarkable hospitality; and as he had a substance, he parted with it chearfully; especially to his countrymen, who never failed of a hearty welcome, as their necessities obliged them to make use of his house. He was also of a charitable and reconciling temper; and took no small pains to make up the differences that happened among the missioners upon account of the archpriest's jurisdiction.'

He wrote: 'Certaine Briefe Notes vpon a Briefe Apologie set out vnder the name of the Priestes vnited to the Archpriest. Drawn by an vnpassionate secular Prieste, friend to bothe partyes, but more frend to the truth. Whereunto is added a seuerall answeare vnto the particularites obiected against certaine Persons,' Paris (1603), 12mo. This work, elicited by Parsons's 'Brief Apology,' was written by Ely shortly before his death and published by an anonymous editor, probably Dr. Christopher Bagshaw [q. v.] It was an important contribution to the archpriest controversy. A copy of the book, probably unique, is in the Grenville Library, British Museum. Ely wrote in English, with a view to publication, the lives of some of the martyrs in Elizabeth's reign, as appears from a letter addressed by him from Pont-à-Mousson, 20 June or July 1587, to Father John Gibbons, S.J., rector of the college of Treves (*Lansd. MS.* 96, art. 26, printed in Foley, iv. 483).

[Dodd's Church Hist. ii. 71; Douay Diaries, p. 421; Ely's Brief Notes; Foley's Records, ii. 150, vi. pp. xii, 730, 737, 742; Fuller's Church Hist. (Brewer), iv. 241, v. 340; Gillow's Bibl. Dict.; Bibl. Grenvilliana, i. 224; Knox's Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen, p. 464; Morris's Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers, ii. 20, iii. 109; Pits, De Angliæ Scriptoribus, p. 803; Simpson's Campion, p. 120; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), i. 739.] T. C.

ELY, NICHOLAS OF (*d.* 1280), chancellor and successively bishop of Worcester and Winchester, may have derived his name from the fact that about 1249 he was appointed archdeacon of Ely. He was also a few years later prebendary of St. Paul's. There is, however, a Nicholas of Ely mentioned as prior of the Cluniac monastery of Daventry in

Northamptonshire between 1231 and 1264 (Dugdale, *Monasticon*, v. 176, from Reg. de Daventr. in MS. Cotton Claudius D. xii. f. 172), whose name also occurs in a letter of Grosseteste to the legate Otho in 1240, and in whose behalf the bishop had made some petition to the legate. In the absence, however, of any express identification, it seems less difficult to assume that this Nicholas of Ely was another person than to suppose that a Cluniac monk left his cloister to become a royal official. Nicholas of Ely must have been a friend of the baronial party, for soon after the triumph of Leicester and Gloucester at the Provisions of Oxford he was elevated to the custody of the great seal. One account says that he became chancellor at the same time that Hugh Bigod became justiciar, i.e. in 1258 (Wykes in *Ann. Mon.* iv. 120); but there is no doubt that the royalist chancellor Wingham was continued in office until 18 Oct. 1260, on which date that functionary, now become bishop of London, handed back the great seal to the king. The old seal was immediately broken, and a new seal delivered to Nicholas of Ely, who at once took the customary oaths and entered upon his duties (*Cal. Rot. Pat.* p. 316); but in July 1261 Henry, having obtained, as was believed, papal authority to dispense him from his oath to the Provisions, dismissed Ely and restored the seal to Walter of Merton (Wykes in *A. M.* iv. 129; *Cal. Rot. Pat.* p. 32 *b*). In 1262, however, he was made treasurer, on the death of John de Caux (*Ann. Dunst.* in *A. M.* iii. 220); and in 1263 the attempt at arbitration between the rival parties seems to have resulted in his reappointment as chancellor. On 1 Sept. he paid the king a fine of fifty marks to have the wardship of the heir and lands of Baldwin of Witsand (Roberts, *Excerpta e Rot. Finium*, ii. 403); and on 18 Sept., when the king went abroad for a short time, the great seal remained in his charge, on the condition that he only signed ordinary writs to which Hugh le Despenser, the justiciar, was the witness (*Fœdera*, i. 433). The same thing happened two months later, on Henry's departure for the arbitration at Amiens (*Cal. Rot. Pat.* 33 *b*). In the middle of July he received the seals again (*ib.* p. 34), but he did not retain them much longer. Before October his name appears again as treasurer (*ib.* p. 34); and on 31 Oct. he witnessed a charter in that capacity (Madox, *Hist. Exchequer*, ii. 319). It seems probable that he was of a moderate or peaceable temper, for, though the nominee of the barons, he was not in any way disgraced on the great triumph of the king's party in 1265. Early in 1266 the death of Walter of Cantelupe [q. v.] had left the see of Worcester vacant. Henry, who had approved of Ely's services, even when he was acting as baronial chancellor, made no opposition to his election to that bishopric. He was chosen on 9 May; the election was confirmed on 19 June; on 19 Sept. he was consecrated at Canterbury along with William de Braose, bishop of Llandaff, by Archbishop Boniface, and a week later was solemnly enthroned in his cathedral. (These dates are from the Worcester Annals in *A. M.* iv. 456; Wykes, *ib.* iv. 190, makes his consecration 'in octavis Pentecostes;' the Winchester and Waverley Annals both put it in September, as does the London Annals, in Stubbs, *Chron. Ed. I and Ed. II*, i. 75.) In August 1266 he was present at Kenilworth, and was one of the six elected by the king to arrange terms for the submission of the disinherited barons (*Ann. Wav.* in *A. M.* ii. 371; *Ann. Dunst. ib.* iii. 242). But early in 1268 the death of John Gervais, bishop of Winchester, at the papal court put, according to the received doctrine, the next presentation to that see in the hands of Clement IV, who, setting aside the election of Richard de la More by the chapter, translated Ely, to his great delight, to the rich and important vacancy. On 2 May the king accepted the papal nomination, and on Whit-Sunday, 27 May, the bishop was enthroned with great state in his new cathedral (*Ann. Wig.* in *A. M.* ii. 136; Wykes, *ib.* iv. 214). In 1269 he consecrated John le Breton to the see of Hereford at Waverley (*Ann. Wint. ib.* ii. 107). In 1270 he witnessed the act by which Edward, the king's son, consigned his children to the care of Richard of Cornwall before starting on crusade (*Fœdera*, i. 484). In 1271 he made a visitation, first of his cathedral and then of his diocese (*Ann. Wint.* ii. 110). In 1272 he was one of the magnates who wrote to Edward to announce his father's death and his own peaceful succession (*Fœdera*, i. 497). In May 1273 he joined Walter, bishop of Exeter, in conferring the pallium on Archbishop Kilwardby, and immediately after the two bishops went to meet Edward I at Paris, on his return from the Holy Land (*Ann. Winton.* ii. 115). In November 1274 he magnificently entertained Kilwardby at Winchester and at Bittern (*ib.* ii. 118); and in the same year consecrated the sacred chrism at the Cistercian abbey of Waverley in Surrey, to which he was ever afterwards much attached. The monks record with pride that he afterwards ate with them in their refectory. In 1276 he entertained the king and queen at Winchester (*Ann. Wig.* iv. 469). In 1278 he was present when Alexander,

king of Scots, performed homage to the king at Westminster (*Parl. Writs*, i. 7). In the same year he dedicated the new church of the monks of Waverley, granting indulgences to all present and entertaining the whole assembly at his own cost (*Ann. Wav.* ii. 390). In 1279 he assisted at the consecration of John of Darlington, archbishop of Dublin, and attended and sent presents of game to Peckham's enthronement (*Reg. Epist. J. Peckham*, xxix. xxx.) During nearly the whole of his episcopal rule at Winchester he was engaged in an obstinate quarrel with his chapter. One of his first acts was, at the instance of the legate Ottobon, to restore as prior a certain Valentine. In 1274 Andrew, the rival prior, endeavoured, at the head of an armed force, to restore himself to his old position. The bishop excommunicated the offenders and placed the town under an interdict. A full inquiry by royal justices, before a jury, led to the imprisonment of the culprits; but so strong was the feeling among the monks in favour of Andrew, that the new prior, Valentine, found his position untenable, and resigned in 1276. In great indignation Ely seized the prior's manors; but the mediation of royal commissioners resulted in Valentine's restoration for a time, with two episcopal nominees among the obedientaries of the house. But before long, 'to show his power,' Ely deposed Valentine altogether, and appointed a Norman, John of Dureville, in his stead. The disgusted monks sought the protection of the Roman curia; but in 1278 the mediation of the abbots of Reading and Glastonbury patched up a peace between Ely and his chapter. The bishop 'put away all rancour' and gave the kiss of peace to all the monks, except those still negotiating in the papal court against him. A little later troubles were renewed, and the king thought it worth while to take the priory in his own hands; though at Christmas, when he held his court at Winchester, he resigned its custody to the bishop. Ely then made a clean sweep of the house, made Adam of Fareham the prior, and appointed his partisans as obedientiaries. This secured his triumph for the rest of his life; but years after his death the after-swell of the storm had not subsided (*Reg. Epist. Peckham*, iii. 806, 837). But on 12 Feb. 1280 Ely died. His body was interred in the church of Waverley Abbey, to which he had so long been a friend; but his heart was deposited in his own cathedral. In his will he left considerable legacies to Worcester Cathedral (*Ann. Wig.* iv. 480). He had promised to assist in building the Franciscan church at Southampton, and Peckham compelled his executors to respect his wishes (*Reg. Epist. Peckham*, i. 255). Ely is described by Wykes (*A. M.* iv. 180) as a man of knowledge and prudence, remarkable both for elegance of character and literary proficiency. He is said to have been a benefactor of the university of Cambridge.

[Annales Monastici, ed. Luard, in Rolls Ser., and especially the Annals of Winchester, Waverley, Worcester, and Wykes, in the second and fourth volumes; Calendarium Rotulorum Patentium; Rymer's Fœdera, vol. i., Record edition; Stubbs's Chronicles of Edward I and Edward II, Rolls Series; Martin's Registrum Epistolarum Johannis Peckham, Rolls Series; Le Neve's Fasti Eccles. Angl. ed. Hardy, i. 350, ii. 447, iii. 10, 52; Godwin, De Præsulibus; Foss's Judges of England, ii. 315–16.] T. F. T.

ELY, WILLIAM (*d.* 1609), catholic divine, brother of Dr. Humphrey Ely [q. v.], was born in Herefordshire, and educated at Brasenose College, Oxford. He graduated B.A. in 1546, and M.A. in 1549 (Boase, *Register of the Univ. of Oxford*, p. 212). In 1552 he was appointed one of the clerks of the market. When Cranmer was brought to the stake to be burnt at Oxford, he took leave of some of his friends standing by, and seeing Ely among them went to shake him by the hand, but the latter, drawing back, said it was not lawful to salute heretics, especially one who falsely returned to the opinions he had forsworn (Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. Townsend, viii. 89). Ely entered into holy orders, supplicated for the degree of B.D. 21 June 1557, and had a preaching license under the seal of the university 25 Nov. 1558. He was always a catholic at heart, though he conformed for a while 'in hopes that things would take another turn.' In 1559 he was appointed the second president of St. John's College, Oxford, by Sir Thomas Pope, its founder, but about 1563 he was removed from that office on account of his refusal to acknowledge the supremacy of the queen over the church of England. Thereupon he retired to the continent, and on his return became a laborious missioner in his own county of Hereford. At length being apprehended he was committed to Hereford gaol, where he spent the remainder of his life. In a report sent to the privy council in 1605 the high sheriff of Herefordshire says: 'Mr. Elie, a prisoner there [at Hereford], is a setter forward of their [the Jesuits'] desperate designs with all his might, having such liberty as that he rideth up and down the country as he listes.' He died in the prison at a great age in 1609, 'being then accounted by those of his persuasion a most holy confessor.' Dodd says that 'his years and strictness of his morals made him both fear'd

and respected, not only by those of his own persuasion, but by most others: who never durst utter anything unbecoming a christian in his presence' (*Church Hist.* ii. 71).

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), i. 739, Fasti, i. 153; Fuller's Church Hist. (Brewer), iv. 241; Gillow's Bibl. Dict.; Foley's Records, iv. 370, 453; Strype's Cranmer, p. 389, folio; Wood's Annals (Gutch), pp. 126, 143; Wood's Colleges and Halls (Gutch), pp. 538, 543.] T. C.

ELYOT, Sir RICHARD (1450?–1522), judge, was son of Simon Elyot, and grandson of Michell Elyot. The family was closely associated with Coker, near Yeovil, Somersetshire. His mother was Joan, daughter of John Bryce, *alias* Basset. He was practising as an advocate in 1492; from 1498 to July 1511 he occupied, as receiver for the crown, the manor of Wansborough, Wiltshire, the forfeited estate of Francis, lord Lovell, attainted in 1485. He was commissioner for the collection of an aid in Wiltshire in 1503, and in Michaelmas of that year became a serjeant-at-law, and soon afterwards attorney-general to the queen. Before this time he married his first wife, Alice Fynderne, niece of Sir Thomas Fynderne, who was executed in 1460, and granddaughter of Sir William Fynderne of Childrey, Berkshire (*d.* 1440). He acted as judge of assize on the western circuit from the opening years of the century; was in the commission of the peace for Cornwall in 1509; was appointed judge of the common pleas, 26 April 1513, and was knighted before 1517. He was summoned to the first three parliaments of Henry VIII's reign; helped to arbitrate with Wolsey and others in a land suit between the corporation of Norwich and the convent of Christchurch, and took part in the preliminary investigation into the charges against Edward Stafford, duke of Buckingham, in 1521. Elyot died after February 1522. His will, proved 26 May following, directs his body to be buried in Salisbury Cathedral, near which he owned property, but it is not known if this direction was carried out. By his first wife Elyot had two children, the famous Sir Thomas Elyot [q. v.], and Marjory, wife of Robert, son of Sir George Puttenham of Sherfield, near Basingstoke. About 1512 Elyot married his second wife, Elizabeth, widow of Richard Fetiplace, and daughter and heiress of William Besilles, through whom he acquired property in Berkshire and Oxfordshire. His will contains many small bequests to religious foundations throughout England.

[Mr. H. H. S. Crofts's full memoir of Sir Thomas Elyot prefixed to his edition of the Governour (1883), gives all accessible information respecting Sir Richard. His will is printed by Mr. Crofts, i. 309–16.] S. L. L.

ELYOT, Sir THOMAS (1490?–1546), diplomatist and author, only son of Sir Richard Elyot [q. v.], by his first wife, Alice Fynderne, was born before 1490. He was doubtless a native of Wiltshire, where his father held estates at Wansborough, Chalk, and Winterslow. According to his own account (*Dict.* pref.) he was educated at home, but his knowledge of Latin and Greek clearly dated from an early age. The tradition that he was a graduate either of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, or Jesus College, Cambridge, is unsupported by documentary evidence. A Thomas Eliett, or Eyllyott, of St. Mary's Hall, was admitted B.A. in June 1518, and B.C.L. 26 Aug. 1523 (*Oxf. Univ. Reg.* Oxf. Hist. Soc. i. 104, 131). Thomas Baker claims Elyot for Jesus College, Cambridge, and says that he proceeded M.A. there in 1506–7. But the name is not an uncommon one, and the dates of all these degrees fail to harmonise with better ascertained facts in Elyot's career. Before he was twenty he read with 'a worshipful physician' (probably Linacre) the works of Galen and other medical writers (*Castel of Helth*, pref.) In 1509 he accompanied his father on a visit to Ivy Church, where a gigantic skeleton had been unearthed (Leland, *Collect.* iv. 141). In 1511 he became clerk of assize on the western circuit, where his father was judge. The deaths of his father in 1522 and of Thomas Fynderne, a young cousin on his mother's side, in 1523, put him in possession of much landed property, including the estates of Combe (now Long Combe), near Woodstock, and the manors of Calton Parva and West Colvile, Cambridgeshire. Elyot made Combe his chief residence, and was in the commission of the peace for Oxfordshire in July 1522. Before 1523 he attracted the notice of Cardinal Wolsey, who, unsolicited, gave him in that year the post of clerk of the privy council, but his patron neglected to provide for the payment of any salary. In November 1527 Elyot was sheriff of Oxfordshire and Berkshire, and in that capacity wrote to Thomas Cromwell (25 March 1527–1528) on some business which concerned the cardinal. This letter, in which Elyot suggests that Cromwell should visit him at Combe, is the first sign of an intimacy which increased rapidly in the following years. In 1528 he resigned the clerkship of assize, and in June 1530 was deprived of the clerkship of the council. He 'was discharged,' he writes, 'without any recompense, rewarded only with the order of knighthood,

honourable and onerous, having much less to live on than before.' He became immediately afterwards a commissioner to inquire into the possessions acquired in Cambridgeshire by his fallen patron, Wolsey, since 1523.

In 1531 Elyot came before the world as an author. He then published his 'Boke called the Governour,' with a dedication to Henry VIII. The work, a treatise on the education of statesmen, immediately acquired popularity at court, and it was doubtless to the increase of reputation which it brought that Elyot's appointment as ambassador to the court of Charles V was due. On 4 Sept. 1531, Chappuys, the imperial ambassador in England, described Elyot as 'a gentleman of 700 or 800 ducats of rent, formerly in the cardinal's service, now in that of the lady (Anne Boleyn) who has promoted him to this charge.' His instructions, dated 7 Oct. 1531, chiefly deal with the necessity of obtaining the emperor's assent to Henry VIII's divorce from Catherine of Arragon. He was also privately directed to assist Stephen Vaughan, the English agent at Antwerp, in his search for William Tyndale, who was in that city. Elyot remained abroad for a few months only, and his diplomatic efforts came to little. He complained bitterly that his letters home were unanswered, and that he received the inadequate allowance of twenty shillings a day when he was forced to spend at least forty shillings. On 5 June 1532 Chappuys saw Elyot in London, and reported to the imperial court that he was courting him as much as possible 'for the better success of the queen's cause.' There can be no doubt that Elyot's sympathies were at the time with Catherine, and that he strongly urged the English ministers to keep on peaceful terms with Charles V.

According to Burnet and Strype, Elyot was engaged on diplomatic business in Rome in September 1532, but this is proved to be an error (Crofts, xci–xciii.) On 18 Nov. 1532, and again on 8 Dec., Elyot made fruitless appeals to Cromwell to procure his release from the office of sheriff of Cambridgeshire, to which he had been appointed for a second time. Both in 1533 and 1534 Elyot was busy at literary work, and he announced his intention in the latter year of devoting himself to it exclusively. But in 1535 he again became ambassador to Charles V. In all probability he left England in May, and joined the emperor at Barcelona, whence he proceeded with him on the expedition to Tunis. He seems to have been in the emperor's suite at Naples at the end of the year, and there learned from the emperor himself the news of the execution of his friend Sir Thomas More, which took place on 6 July 1535 (William Roper, *Life of Sir T. More*). Elyot was home at Combe in 1536. A proclamation was then issued demanding the surrender of all papist publications, and of one of Fisher's sermons. Elyot wrote to Cromwell acknowledging that he had a large library, and that he had purchased a copy of the prohibited sermon, but he did not know where it was, and he denied that his books were of the character denounced in the proclamation. In a second letter to Cromwell of about the same date (July 1536), Elyot, while complaining that his religion was needlessly suspected, admitted that 'the amity between me and Sir Thomas More' was 'usque ad aras,' but he insisted that he had accepted the reformed doctrine. He entreats that adequate payment should be made him in consideration of his diplomatic and other official services, for which he had received no reward. In 1536 and 1537 he began his Latin-English dictionary; Henry VIII lent him books and encouraged him to persevere when doubts of his capacity made him anxious to relinquish it. It was issued in 1538. In 1540 Elyot took part in the reception of Anne of Cleves at Blackheath, and on 14 May of the same year bought of Cromwell the manors of Carleton and Willingham, Cambridgeshire. Cromwell was attainted before the purchase was complete, and the property reverted to the crown, but it was re-granted to Elyot 4 Aug. He was M.P. for Cambridge in 1542 (Willis, *Not. Parl.* i. 190), and sheriff of Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire November 1544. He died 20 March 1546, and was buried in Carleton church. A monument was erected to his memory, but it is now destroyed. Elyot left no will and no children. His heir was Richard Puttenham, elder son of his sister Marjory. A portrait by Holbein in the Windsor collection was engraved by Bartolozzi.

Elyot married, after 1522, Margaret, daughter of John Abarrow, of North Charford, Hampshire. A portrait of her by Holbein is now at Windsor Castle. After Elyot's death she married Sir James Dwyer. She was buried at Great Staughton, Huntingdonshire, 26 Aug. 1560.

Elyot's literary work, although it exhibits no striking originality, illustrates the wide culture and erudition of Henry VIII's court. Political philosophy and the theory of education chiefly interested him. His views were borrowed from the foreign writers of the Renaissance. Erasmus's influence is plainly discernible. Pico della Mirandola, Francesco Patrizi the elder, and other less-known

Italian authors were familiar to him. His intimate friends included Sir Thomas More and Roger Ascham. As a Greek scholar who first translated part of Isocrates into English, and as an early student of both Greek and Latin patristic literature, he well deserves to be remembered. That he should have written all his books in his native language gives him a high place among the pioneers of English prose literature. His style is clear, although its literary flavour is thin. His fame as a translator lived through Elizabeth's reign. Nashe the satirist writes that 'Sir Thomas Elyot's elegance in translation did sever itself from all equals.'

All Elyot's books issued in his lifetime were published in London by Thomas Berthelet. They are as follows: 1. 'The Boke named the Gouernour, deuised by Sir Thomas Elyot, knight,' 1531, 1534, 1537, 1546, 1557, 1565, and 1580, dedicated to Henry VIII. The twofold object of the work was 'to instruct men in such virtues as shall be expedient for them, which shall have authority in a weal public, and to educate those youths that hereafter may be deemed worthy to be governors.' Much is borrowed from Patrizi's 'De Regno & Regis Institutione' (Paris, 1518), from Erasmus's 'Institutio Principis Christiani,' and Pontano's 'De Principe.' The latest edition, a reprint of the 1531 issue, was carefully edited by Mr. H. H. S. Crofts in 1883. 2. 'Pasquil the Playne,' 1533 and 1540, a prose dialogue between Pasquil, Gnatho, and Harpocrates on the advantages of loquacity and silence. Gnatho advocates the former, Harpocrates the latter, and Pasquil, who takes a neutral side, indulges in some severe satire. The work, which opens with a quotation from Æschylus, may have been suggested by the 'Dialogus Marphorii et Pasquilli,' issued at Rome about 1552, a copy of which Bonner sent as a gift to Cromwell 24 Dec. 1532. No copy of either the first or second edition is in the British Museum (Collier, *Bibliog. Cat.* i. 254; Ames, *Typ. Antiq.* iii. 307). 3. 'Of the Knowledge which maketh a Wise Man,' 1533 and 1534, a prose dialogue, on philosophical topics, between Plato and Aristippus, suggested by a perusal of Diogenes Laertius's account of Plato. A letter to Honor, second wife of Arthur Plantagenet, Viscount Lisle, is printed at the close of the volume. 4. 'A Swete and devoute Sermon of Holy Saynt Ciprian of the Mortalitie of Man;' 'The Rules of a Christian Lyfe, made by Picus, Erle of Mirandula,' 1534, two tracts, dedicated to Susan, wife of John Kyngstone, a daughter of the Richard Fetiplace whose widow was the second wife of Elyot's father. Cyprian's sermon was doubtless translated from Erasmus's edition (Basle, 1520). 5. 'The Doctrine of Princes, made by the noble oratour Isocrates, and translated out of Greke in to Englishe,' London, 1534, a translation of the Oration to Nicocles. 6. 'The Castel of Helth,' London, 1534, 1539, 1541, 1561, 1580 (?), 1595. No copy of the first edition, assigned to 1534 and stated to have been dedicated to Cromwell, is now known. A letter to Cromwell in Harl. MS. 6989, No. 21, is clearly intended as a dedicatory epistle, and cannot be dated later than 1534. The book is a medical treatise of prescriptions for various ailments, and Elyot gives an account of the disorders from which he himself suffered. The fact that it was written in English by one who was not a doctor roused much wrath on the part of the medical profession. Elyot replied to his medical critics in a preface to the edition of 1541. The treatise was very popular till the close of the century. 7. 'The Bankette of Science,' London, 1539, 1542, 1545, 1557, a collection of moral sayings chiefly from the fathers. 8. 'The Dictionary of Syr T. Eliot, knyght,' London, fol. 1538 and 1545, Latin-English. The copy presented by Elyot to Cromwell is at the British Museum, and with it there is a long Latin letter by Elyot to Cromwell. An edition revised by Thomas Cooper (1517?–1594) [q. v.] appeared with the title 'Bibliotheca Eliotæ' in 1550, 1552, and 1559. 9. 'The Education or Bringinge up of Children, translated out of Plutarche,' London, n.d. 4to. This book is mentioned in the 'Image of Governance' (1540), and is therefore earlier than 1540. The 'British Museum Catalogue' dates it conjecturally in 1535. 10. 'The Defence of Good Women,' London, 1545, a dialogue between Caninnis, Candidus, and Queen Zenobia. 11. 'The Image of Governance, compiled of the actes and sentences notable of the moste noble Emperour Alexander Severus, late translated out of Greke into Englyshe,' London, 1540, 1544, 1549, and (by William Seres) 1556; compiled from notes made in 1529 and 1530, while writing the 'Governour.' These notes were partly translated, according to Elyot, from a Greek manuscript by Eucolpius, the Emperor Alexander Severus's secretary. This manuscript had been lent to Elyot by a gentleman of Naples named Pudericus or Poderico. To the translation Elyot added extracts from other authors, both Latin and Greek, dealing with the duties of rulers. The subject resembles that of Guevara's 'Libro Aureo,' translated by Lord Berners [see Bourchier, John, second Baron Berners] in 1533. William Wotton [q. v.] endeavoured to convict Elyot of plagiarism

from Guevara and other writers, and asserted that the statement that it had been translated from a Greek manuscript by Eucolpius was false. Dr. Humphrey Hody denied with equal vigour that Elyot could have had any direct acquaintance with Eucolpius's writings (*Treatise on Septuagint*). A careful perusal of Elyot's preface and text acquits Elyot of Wotton's and Hody's charges. Elyot's preface contains a list of his previous works. 12. 'Howe one may take profyte of his enmyes, translated out of Plutarche,' London, n.d. Since no mention is made of this work in 'The Image,' it is probably to be dated after 1540, although the British Museum Catalogue suggests the date 1535. To fill up some blank pages at the end Elyot added 'The Maner to chose and cheryshe a friende,' a collection of 'sayings' from classical authors. Berthelet reprinted the two pieces with the 'Table of Cebes,' a translation by Sir Francis Poyntz. 13. 'A Preservative agaynste Deth,' London, 1545, dedicated to Sir Edward North, a collection of passages from Scripture and the fathers.

Ascham writes in his 'Toxophilus' (1545) that Elyot told him 'he had a worcke in hand which he nameth "De rebus memorabilibus Angliæ."' This book, if completed, was, so far as our present information goes, never published. A manuscript belonging to G. F. Wilbraham, esq., of Delamere House, Chester, gives an account of 'commendable deedes' concerning Chester, and among the authors whom the writer says he has consulted is 'Sir Thomas Eliot, his chronicle of the description of Brettaine.' It is quite possible that Hollinshed or Harrison may have had access to such a manuscript. Eight lines, translated into English from Horace's 'Ars Poetica,' are attributed to Elyot by William Webbe in his 'Discourse of English Poetry.'

[Mr. H. H. S. Crofts collects all the information in his long introduction to his valuable edition of the Governour (1883). He prints Elyot's letters to Cromwell there, and an interesting despatch addressed to the Duke of Norfolk while on his first embassy. See also Cooper's Athenæ Cantabr. i. 89; Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, ed. Brewer and Gairdner; Brit. Mus. Cat.; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ed. Bliss, i. 150; Fuller's Worthies; Strype's Memorials.] S. L. L.

ELYS, EDMUND (*fl.* 1707), divine and poet, was born at Haccombe, Devonshire, in or about 1634, being the son of Edmund Elys, rector of East Allington in the same county, by his wife Ursula, daughter of John Carew of Haccombe. After receiving some preliminary instruction from William Hayter at Exeter, he entered Balliol College, Oxford, as a commoner in Lent term 1651, was admitted probationer fellow of that house 29 Nov. 1655, having taken his B.A. degree on 16 Oct. previously, and proceeded M.A. 11 June 1658. He resigned his fellowship 1 Nov. 1659, in which year he succeeded his father in the rectory of East Allington. Writing in 1707 he refers to his father's death as having involved him 'in a labyrinth of afflictions; some of them lie hard upon me to this day.' During 1659 he adds: 'I was made a prisoner to Major Blackmore in Exeter upon suspicion (of what I was not falsly suspected) that I was a close enemy to the Common Wealth of England, and that I desir'd the prosperity of a design to destroy it by an insurrection, &c.' In 1666 other 'prodigious afflictions fell on me' (*The Quiet Soul*, 2nd ed.) His living was under sequestration in 1677, and he found himself 'forced to abscond about London.' In 1680 he was confined in the King's Bench and other prisons. On the accession of William III, Elys, for refusing to take the oaths, was deprived of his rectory. He retired to Totnes, where he was living in 1707, aged 72, a martyr to asthma (*ib.*) Elys was learned and well-meaning, but his fantastic mode of living and writing drew down on him the ridicule of those whom he wished to convince. Although he does not appear ever to have joined the society, he was a warm friend of the quakers, whose principles he defended in numerous leaflets. A list of these pieces, which were mostly printed at quaker presses, will be found in Joseph Smith's 'List of Friends' Books,' i. 572–5. His poems present a series of tiresome conceits strung together in execrable rhythm. He is author of: 1. 'Dia Poemata: Poetick Feet standing upon Holy Ground; or, Verses on certain Texts of Scripture. With Epigrams, &c. By E. E.,' 8vo, London, 1655. 2. 'An Alphabet of Elegiack Groans upon the truly lamented Death of that Rare Exemplar of Youthful Piety, John Fortescue, of the Inner Temple, Esquire. By E. E.,' 4to, London, 1656. 3. 'Divine Poems. With a short description of Christian Magnanimity. By E. E.,' 8vo, Oxford, 1658. 4. 'Miscellanea: sive Meditationes, Orationes,' &c., 8vo, [? Oxford] 1658; another edition, enlarged, 4to, Oxford, 1662. 5. 'The Quiet Soul; or, The Peace and Tranquillity of a Christian's Estate. Set forth in two Sermons [on Matt. xi. 29],' Oxford, 1659; 2nd edition, Exeter, 1707, 4to. 6. 'An Exclamation to all those that love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, against an Apology written by an ingenious person [Thomas Sprat] for Mr. Cowley's lascivious and prophane verses. By a dutiful son of the Church of England,' 4to, London, 1670. 7. 'Omnes qui audiunt Evangelium,

idque verum agnoscunt, sunt gratiæ et salutis capaces. Thesis in Academia Oxoniensi explicata 1662: cui accesserunt animadversiones in aliqua Jansenii atque etiam Calvini dogmata veritati prædictæ adversa,' 8vo, London, 1677. 8. 'A Vindication of the Doctrine concerning the Light within, against the Objections of George Keith in his Book entituled "The Deism of W. Penn and his Brethren expos'd,"' 4to, London, 1699. Other tracts in answer to Keith. 9. 'Socinianismus purus putus Antichristianismus: seu omnimodæ Socinianismi iniquitatis demonstratio,' 8vo, London, 1701. 10. 'Animadversiones in aliqua Philippi Limburgii Dogmata,' 8vo, London, 1702. 11. 'Animadversiones in aliqua C. Jansenii, Guilielmi Twissi, Richardi Baxteri, et Gerardi de Vries, Dogmata, quæ Doctrinæ Evangelicæ de Benevolentia Divina Hominibus per Christum exhibita advertantur,' 8vo, London, 1706. Elys republished 'The Opinion of Mr. Perkins and Mr. Bolton and others concerning the Sport of Cock-fighting,' 4to, Oxford, 1660, in order to show that such sport 'is not a recreation meet for Christians, though so commonly used by those who own that name' (printed also in 'Harleian Miscellany,' vol. vi. eds. 1744, 1808). He also edited in 1694 'Letters on Several Subjects' by Dr. Henry More, of whose writings he was an enthusiastic admirer and with whom he frequently corresponded.

His portrait, at the age of twenty-eight, was engraved by Faithorne, 1662.

[Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ed. Bliss, iv. 470–5; Wood's Fasti Oxon. ed. Bliss, ii. 186, 214; Granger's Biog. Hist. of England, 2nd ed. iii. 298; Evans's Cat. of Engraved Portraits, i. 112.]

G. G.

EMERSON, WILLIAM (1701–1782), mathematician, the son of Dudley Emerson, a schoolmaster, was born at Hurworth, Durham, on 14 May 1701. He was first educated by his father and a curate who boarded in the house, and was afterwards sent to school at Newcastle, and then at York. Returning to Hurworth, he took pupils, but possessing no gift of teaching, and his temper being warm, he soon lost them, and determined to live on the income of 70*l.* or 80*l.* left him by his father. Though by no means studious as a boy, he now devoted himself entirely to the study of mathematics, but not till 1749 did he publish his treatise on 'Fluxions,' the first of a series of books, a list of which will be found below. In 1763 he walked to London to arrange with Nourse, the publisher, for a regular course of mathematical manuals for young students, and the publication of these followed in rapid succession. They were fairly successful, for Emerson, though he possessed no originating power, had a comprehensive grasp of all existing knowledge in all branches of his subject; but they were found too advanced for their alleged purpose, the explanations and demonstrations being far too concise to be readily understood by the young. While staying in London, Emerson resided with a watchmaker that he might learn his trade, in which, in common with all branches of practical mechanics, he took a keen interest. He was accustomed to make for himself all instruments required for the illustration of his studies, and he constructed for his wife an elaborate spinning-wheel, a drawing of which is inserted in his 'Mechanics' (fig. 191). His knowledge extended to the theory of music, and though he was but a poor performer, his services were much in request for the tuning of harpsichords, as also for the cleaning of clocks. His favourite amusement was fishing, and he would frequently stand up to his middle in water for hours together. The studied eccentricity of his dress produced a belief that he dealt in magic, and he professed to be much annoyed at the frequency with which his advice was sought for the discovery of secrets. His manner and address were extremely uncouth, and though he could talk well on almost any subject, he was very positive and impatient of contradiction. He declined to become a member of the Royal Society, because, as he said, 'it was a d—d hard thing that a man should burn so many farthing candles as he had done, and then have to pay so much a year for the honour of F.R.S. after his name.' Towards the end of his life he suffered much from stone, of which he eventually died on 20 May 1782. He had married in 1732 or 1733 a niece of Dr. Johnson, at that time rector of Hurworth, but had no children. In addition to his books, Emerson was a frequent contributor to the 'Ladies' Diary,' the 'Palladium,' the 'Miscellanea Curiosa Mathematica,' and other periodicals, in which he wrote over various signatures, among them being 'Merones,' 'Nichol Dixon,' and 'Philofluentimechanalgegeomastrolongo.' He also carried on a long controversy in the 'Gentleman's Magazine' with an anonymous correspondent, who attacked his views on astronomy (*Gent. Mag.* xli. 113, 349, 398, 490, 538, xlii. 74). Dr. Morgan (*Arithmetical Books*, p. 78) remarks that Emerson was as much overrated as Thomas Simpson was underrated. The following is a list of Emerson's publications: 1. 'Fluxions,' 1749, 3rd edit., enlarged, 1768. 2. 'The Projection of the Sphere,' 1749. 3. 'Elements of Trigonometry,' 1749, 2nd edit., 1764. 4. 'Prin-

ciples of Mechanicks,' 1758, 5th edit., 1825. 5. 'The Doctrine of Proportions,' 1763. 6. 'Elements of Geometry,' 1763, new edit., 1794. 7. 'The Method of Increments,' 1763. 8. 'Cyclomathesis,' 1763, 2nd edit., 1770. 9. 'Treatise on Algebra,' 1764. 10. 'Navigation,' 1764. 11. 'The Arithmetic of Infinites,' 1767. 12. 'Elements of Conic Sections,' 1767. 13. 'Elements of Optics,' 1768. 14. 'Perspective,' 1768. 15. 'The Laws of Centripetal and Centrifugal Force,' 1769. 16. 'The Art of Surveying or Measuring Land,' 1770. 17. 'Calculation, Libration, and Mensuration,' 1770. 18. 'Chronology,' 1770. 19. 'Dialling,' 1770. 20. 'The Doctrine of Combinations, Permutations, and Composition of Quantities,' 1770. 21. 'The Mathematical Principles of Geography,' 1770. 22. 'A short Comment on Sir I. Newton's "Principia,"' 1770. 23. 'A System of Astronomy,' 1770. 24. 'Miscellanies,' 1776. 25. 'Tracts, with a Memoir of the Author by W. Bowe,' 1794.

[W. Bowe's Some Account of the Life of W. Emerson, Lond. 1793; Hutton's Phil. and Math. Dict. i. 471; Gent. Mag. lxiii. 610; Brit. Mus. and Bodleian Catalogues.] A. V.

EMERY, EDWARD (*d.* 1850 ?), numismatist, under whose direction the notorious imitations of coins known as 'Emery's forgeries' were produced, was a coin-collector and coin-dealer living in London. He is said to have belonged to 'a respectable family,' and to have been well off. He engaged an engraver at considerable expense to manufacture dies of rare English and Irish coins, and some of the specimens struck off from these dies sold for large sums. The forgeries were in the market during the summer of 1842, but they were exposed in the 'Times' and in the 'Numismatic Chronicle.' Before the end of that year Emery (or his engraver) was obliged to surrender the dies, which were then cut through the centre and thus rendered useless. Emery's forgeries are: penny of Edward VI, with portrait; shillings of Edward VI with false countermarks of portcullis and greyhound; jeton or coin of Lady Jane Grey as queen of England; half-crown and shilling of Philip and Mary; gold 'rial' of Mary I; groats and half-groats of Mary I (English and Irish), and probably others. The forgeries are clever, though the lettering is not successful. After 1842 Emery is believed to have left London in debt, and to have died at Hastings about 1850.

[Hawkins's Medallic Illustrations of Brit. Hist., ed. Franks and Grueber, i. 63, 64, ii. 725, from information supplied by the late W. Webster, the London coin-dealer; Numismatic Chron. (old ser.), v. 159, 160, 202, 203, where the Times of 19 July 1842 is quoted; Emery's forgeries in Brit. Mus.] W. W.

EMERY, JOHN (1777–1822), actor, was born at Sunderland 22 Sept. 1777, and obtained a rudimentary education at Ecclesfield in the West Riding of Yorkshire. His father, Mackle Emery (*d.* 18 May 1825), was a country actor, and his mother, as Mrs. Emery, sen., appeared 6 July 1802 at the Haymarket as Dame Ashfield in Morton's 'Speed the Plough,' and subsequently played at Covent Garden. Emery was brought up for a musician, and when twelve years of age was in the orchestra at the Brighton theatre. At this house he made his first appearance as Old Crazy in the farce of 'Peeping Tom.' John Bernard [q. v.] says that in the summer of 1792 Mr. and Mrs. Emery and their son John, a lad of about seventeen, who played a fiddle in the orchestra and occasionally went on in small parts, were with him at Teignmouth, again at Dover, where young Emery played country boys, and again in 1793 at Plymouth. Bernard claims to have been the means of bringing Emery on the stage, and tells (*Retrospections*, ii. 257) an amusing story concerning the future comedian. After playing a short engagement in Yorkshire with Tate Wilkinson, who predicted his success, he was engaged to replace T. Knight at Covent Garden, where he was first seen, 21 Sept. 1798, as Frank Oatland in Morton's 'A Cure for the Heartache.' Lovegold in the 'Miser,' Oldcastle in the 'Intriguing Chambermaid,' Abel Drugger in the 'Tobacconist,' an alteration by Francis Gentleman of Jonson's 'Alchymist,' and many other parts followed. On 13 June 1800 he appeared for the first time at the Haymarket as Zekiel Homespun in the 'Heir-at-Law,' a character in the line he subsequently made his own. At Covent Garden, 11 Feb. 1801, he was the original Stephen Harrowby in Colman's 'Poor Gentleman.' In 1801 he played at the Haymarket Clod in the 'Young Quaker' of O'Keeffe, Farmer Ashfield in 'Speed the Plough,' and other parts. From this time until his death he remained at Covent Garden, with the exception of playing at the English Opera House, 16 Aug. 1821, as Giles in the 'Miller's Maid,' an unprinted comic opera founded on one of the rural tales of Blomfield, and attributed to Waldron. For a time he was kept to old men. His reputation was, however, established in country men, in which he had an absolute and undisputed supremacy. He was the original Dan in Colman's 'John Bull,' 5 March 1803; Tyke in Morton's 'School of Reform,' 15 Jan. 1805; Ralph Hempseed in Colman's 'X Y Z,' 11 Dec. 1810; Dandie Dinmont in Terry's

'Guy Mannering,' 12 March 1816; and Ratcliff in Terry's 'Heart of Midlothian,' 17 April 1819. Of many other characters in different lines Emery was the first exponent, and the number of parts he assumed was very great. His last performance was Edie Ochiltree in 'The Antiquary,' 29 June 1822. On 25 July 1822 he died of inflammation of the lungs in Hyde Street, Bloomsbury, and was buried 1 Aug. in a vault in St. Andrew's, Holborn. On 5 Aug. 1822, under the patronage of the Duke of York, the 'Rivals' and 'Belles without Beaux,' with a concert, were given at Covent Garden for the benefit of the aged parents and widow with seven children of the late Mr. Emery. An address by Colman was spoken by Bartley, and a large sum was realised.

Tyke was Emery's great part, in which he left no successor. He was excellent in some Shakespearean parts. Of his Barnardine in 'Measure for Measure' Genest, a reserved critic, says, 'Emery looked and acted inimitably.' His Caliban and Silence in 'King Henry IV' were excellent. His Ralph in the 'Maid of the Mill,' Dougal in 'Rob Roy,' Hodge in 'Love in a Village,' Winter in the 'Steward,' Sam Sharpset, John Lump, Andrew in 'Love, Law, and Physic' were unsurpassable performances. In the 'New Monthly Magazine,' October 1821, a writer, assumably Talfourd, says Emery 'is one of the most real, hearty, and fervid of actors. He is half a Munden. . . . He has the pathos but not the humour, the stoutness but not the strangeness, the heart but not the imagination of the greatest of living comedians. . . . To be half a Munden is the highest praise we can give to any other actor, short of a Kean or a Macready.' Hazlitt says of his acting: 'It is impossible to praise it sufficiently because there is never any opportunity of finding fault with it' (*Criticisms and Dramatic Essays*, 87–8), and Leigh Hunt says he does not know one of his rustic characters 'in which he is not altogether excellent and almost perfect' (*Critical Essays*, 106). In the 'London Magazine,' iii. 517, his Tyke is declared inimitable, and his acting is said to remind the writer of a bottle of old port, and to possess 'a fine rough and mellow flavour that forms an irresistible attraction.' Gilliland's 'Dramatic Synopsis,' 1804, p. 107, says Mr. Emery's delineation of Orson in the 'Iron Chest' is 'a fine picture of savage nature characterised by a peculiar justice of colouring.' Emery was about five feet nine inches, robustly built, with a light complexion and light blue eyes. He looked like one of his own farmers, sang well with a low tenor voice, composed the music and words of a few songs, and for his benefit wrote annually comic effusions, one of which, a song entitled 'York, you're wanted,' enjoyed a long reputation. He had considerable powers of painting, and exhibited between 1801 and 1817 nineteen pictures, chiefly sea pieces, at the Royal Academy. He was a shrewd observer, an amusing companion, and a keen sportsman, very fond of driving four-in-hand. Unfortunately he drank to excess, and was never so happy as when in the society of jockeys and pugilists. He married in 1802 a Miss Anne Thompson, the daughter of a tradesman in the Borough. No less than seven portraits of him in various characters, of which four are by Dewilde, and one, presenting him with Liston, Mathews, and Blanchard in 'Love, Law, and Physic,' by Clint, are in the Mathews collection in the Garrick Club.

[Books cited; Genest's Account of the Stage; Oxberry's Dramatic Biog. vol. ii.; Thespian Dict.; Gilliland's Dramatic Mirror; The Drama, 1821, vol. i.; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1884; Reminiscences of Thomas Dibdin, 1827, vol. ii.]

J. K.

EMERY, SAMUEL ANDERSON (1817–1881), actor, the son of John Emery [q. v.], was born in Hyde Street, Bloomsbury, 10 Sept. 1817. He was educated at Bridport Hall, Edmonton, under W. Fitch, who, besides being a schoolmaster, was lessee of the City Theatre, Milton Street. On leaving school he was placed with his uncle, John Thompson, an Irish provision dealer, and became also clerk to a stockbroker, and subsequently to a jeweller and goldsmith. In May 1834 he appeared at the Queen's Theatre, Tottenham Street (then known as the Fitzroy), in his father's character of Dan in 'John Bull.' This led to an engagement, and under the name of Anderson he played at the same house as Robin Roughhead, and assumably in other parts. He then engaged at Hull with Downe, the manager of the York circuit, proceeded in 1835 to Edinburgh under Murray, and played in various small Scotch houses. He then became established in Liverpool, and for several years played there, at Manchester, Chester, and neighbouring towns. As Giles in the 'Miller's Maid,' and Lovegold in the 'Miser,' he made, 18 April 1843, at the Lyceum, his first appearance in London. He was engaged by Henry Wallack for Covent Garden, and appeared there 19 Oct. 1843 as Fixture in 'A Roland for an Oliver.' Here, through the intended vengeance of some stage carpenter whose schemes he frustrated, his life is said to have been attempted. In 1844 he was at the Lyceum under the Keeleys. In such parts as Jonas Chuzzlewit, Will Fern in the 'Chimes,' Peery-

bingle in the 'Cricket on the Hearth,' and Antony Latour in the 'Creole' of Shirley Brooks, he established his reputation. He then joined Leigh Murray at the Olympic, was stage-manager for Charles Shepherd at the Surrey, and went in 1850 to Drury Lane, then under Mr. Anderson. He played at various country houses during the summer, and at Drury Lane was seen in many parts, chiefly in his father's line. Dandie Dinmont, Silky, Baillie Nicol Jarvie, Autolycus, Touchstone, the Gravedigger, Miramont in the 'Elder Brother,' Sam in 'Raising the Wind,' Gibbie in the 'Wonder,' Harrop in 'Mary the Maid of the Inn,' &c., were all taken about this period. He then joined B. Webster of the Haymarket and Adelphi. At the Olympic in 1853 under A. Wigan he was the original Fouché in Tom Taylor's 'Plot and Passion,' and was subsequently Mr. Potter in the 'Still Waters run deep' of the same author. He was seldom long at any theatre. At various houses accordingly he played Simon Legree in 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' McClosky in the 'Octoroon,' Dan'l Peggotty in 'Little Em'ly,' Captain Cuttle in 'Heart's Delight,' A. Halliday's version of 'Dombey and Son.' This last character, played at the Globe 17 Dec. 1873, served for his return to the theatre 20 July 1878. Emery had an impetuous temper. Somewhere about 1860 he went to America, but returned at once through disagreements with his managers. In Australia also, whither towards the close of his life he proceeded, he was not a success. Six weeks after his return from Australia he died, 19 July 1881, of erysipelas at King William Street, Strand. He was in 1857 manager for a short time of the Marylebone Theatre. In addition to the houses mentioned he played at Covent Garden, the Princess's, Haymarket, and Standard Theatres. Emery was a striking, a strong, and a picturesque actor. He had a manly bearing and much blunt pathos. His success was greatest in his father's line of characters. From his father also he inherited some skill in draughtsmanship.

[Tallis's Drawing Room Table Book; Era Almanack; Era newspaper, 23 July 1881; personal recollections.] J. K.

EMES, JOHN (*fl.* 1785–1805), engraver and water-colour painter, is best known by his engraving of the picture by James Jefferys of 'The Destruction of the Spanish Batteries before Gibraltar.' The etching for this is dated 1786, and as it was published in October 1789 by Emes and Elizabeth Woollett, widow of the celebrated engraver, it is possible that it may have been begun, or intended to have been begun, by Woollett himself. Emes was also a clever water-colour painter, and executed pleasing tinted drawings of views in the Lake district and elsewhere, some of which he exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1790 and 1791. There are three water-colour drawings by Emes in the Print Room at the British Museum, one being a large drawing representing 'The Meeting of the Royal Society of British Archers in Gwersylt Park, Denbighshire;' the figures in this are drawn by R. Smirke, R.A., and it was afterwards engraved in aquatint by C. Apostool. A set of sixteen views of the lakes in Cumberland and Westmoreland, drawn by J. Smith and J. Emes, were engraved in aquatint by S. Alken [q. v.]; these were incorporated into West's 'Guide to the Lakes.' Emes also engraved some views of Dorsetshire. His collection of prints was sold on 22 March 1810, he being then deceased.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Upcott's English Topography; Sale Catalogue of Emes's Collection.] L. C.

EMES, THOMAS (*d.* 1707), known as 'the prophet,' was an impudent quack who practised as a surgeon among the poorer classes. In the hope of obtaining notoriety he allied himself with the Camisards or French prophets, a pack of crazy enthusiasts who scandalised the town by their indecent buffooneries. He died at Old Street Square, London, 23 Dec. 1707, and was buried on Christmas day in Bunhill Fields. 'Under the operation of the Spirit' his brethren were enabled to prophesy that he would rise from his grave between twelve at noon and six in the evening of 25 May 1708. No 'cloathing' was to be provided, for rising 'pure and innocent,' it would not, they declared, 'be esteem'd indecency for him to walk naked unto his habitation' (*Predictions concerning the Raising the Dead Body of Mr. T. Emes*, 4to, London, 1708?). Three days before the pretended resurrection the government, fearing disturbances, and to prevent any tricks being played, placed guards at the grave and about the cemetery (Luttrell, *Relation of State Affairs*, 1857, vi. 307).

Emes wrote: 1. 'A Dialogue between Alkali and Acid . . . wherein a late pretended new hypothesis, asserting Alkali the cause, and Acid the cure of all diseases, is proved groundless and dangerous. Being a specimen of the immodest self-applause, shameful contempt, and abuse of all physicians, gross mistakes and great ignorance of the pretender John Colbatch. By T. E. Chirurgo-Medicus,' 8vo, London, 1698. 2. 'A Letter to a Gentleman concerning Alkali and Acid. Being an

answer to a late piece, intituled A Letter to a Physician concerning Acid and Alkali. To which is added, a Specimen of a new Hypothesis, for the sake of Lovers of Medicine,' 8vo, London, 1700. 3. 'The Atheist turn'd Deist, and the Deist turn'd Christian: or, the Reasonableness and Union of Natural and the True Christian Religion,' 8vo, London, 1698.

[Gent. Mag. 3rd ser. i. 398; Spinckes's The New Pretenders to Prophecy examin'd, &c., in Dr. George Hickes's The Spirit of Enthusiasm Exorcised (1709), pp. 372, 373, 508, 509–30.] G. G.

EMILY, EDWARD, M.D. (1617–1657), Harveian orator, was the third son of Maximilian Emily of Helmdon, Northamptonshire, and Elizabeth, daughter and coheiress of John Waleston of Ruislip, Middlesex, and was baptised on 20 April 1617. He was entered on the books at Leyden on 8 Oct. 1640, and he graduated M.D. on 10 Nov. following. On 25 June 1641 he was admitted licentiate of the College of Physicians; he became a candidate on 22 Dec. 1643 and a fellow on 8 May 1647, having been in the meantime incorporated M.D. at Oxford, being described as of Christ Church. He was elected Gulstonian lecturer in 1649, treating during his course no less learnedly of atoms than of anatomy, and was censor of the college in 1652 and 1653. He was the first Harveian orator in 1656, and gave great offence to his colleagues by speaking in his oration with unseemly virulence against the army and the existing Commonwealth. A vote of censure was passed, but, on his affirming that he had intended no harm, and the technical portion of his speech being found of high merit, the censure was removed. It was determined, however, that in future all Harveian orations should be handed to the president and censors of the college to be read and approved at least a month before their delivery. Emily was senior physician at St. Thomas's Hospital, and practised in the neighbourhood of Silver Street. He died on 14 Nov. 1657, aged forty, and was buried in the church of St. Olave's, Silver Street, the funeral being attended by a large concourse of members of the College of Physicians. Baldwin Hamey [q. v.] (*Bustorum aliquot Reliquiæ*, MS., R.C.P.) speaks of him in terms of high praise, declaring that time only failed him to become one of the greatest adornments of his profession. He married Elizabeth, daughter of John Millington of Wandsworth, and by her he had an only son, John, who became a distinguished merchant in the city. Wood (*Fasti Oxon.* ii. 94) states that Emily 'in 1652 or 1653 held up his hand at the bar, at an assize held in Oxford, for coining, but being freed went to London and practised his faculty in the parish of St. Olave's.' He gives, however, no authority for his allegation, which is scarcely consistent with the fact that at both the dates he mentions Emily held the high office of censor of the College of Physicians.

[Munk's Coll. of Phys. i. 244; Baker's Hist. of Northamptonshire, i. 629.] A. V.

EMLYN, SOLLOM (1697–1754), legal writer, second son of Thomas Emlyn [q.v.], was born at Dublin (T. Emlyn, *Works*, i. xx et seq.), where his father was at the time settled, 27 Dec. 1697. He studied law, entered as a student at Leyden 17 Sept. 1714, became a member of Lincoln's Inn, and rose to be of great reputation as a chamber counsel. Emlyn was anxious for reforms of the law, and very forcibly pointed out the defects in the system as then practised. He remarks in 1730 on the 'tediousness and delays' of civil suits, 'the exorbitant fees to counsel, whereto the costs recovered bear no proportion,' the overgreat 'nicety of special pleadings,' the scandal of the ecclesiastical courts. In criminal law he objects to the forced unanimity of the jury, the Latin record of the proceedings, the refusal of counsel to those charged with felony, the practice of pressing to death obstinately mute prisoners, capital punishment for trifling offences, 'the oppressions and extortions of gaolers,' and generally the bad management of gaols (Preface to *State Trials*). Emlyn died 28 June 1754. He was interred in Bunhill Fields burying-ground, where there is an inscription to his memory. He married on 10 Nov. 1729 Mary, daughter of Rev. William Woodhouse, by whom he had two sons: Thomas, a chancery barrister, who died in 1796; and Sollom (*d.* 1744).

Emlyn published: 1. 'Sir Matthew Hales's History of the Pleas of the Crown,' 1736. 2. 'Queries relating to Elizabeth Canning's Case, with Answers,' 1754. He also edited the second edition of the 'State Trials,' printed with a preface in six volumes folio in 1730, and an edition of his father's works, with a prefatory biography (4th ed. 3 vols. 1746).

[Information communicated by Mr. Justin Simpson of Stamford; Peacock's Index of Leyden Students (1883), p. 33; Gent. Mag. July 1754, p. 340; Brit. Mus. Cat. Add. MS. 6210, f. 94 (formerly f. 64); information from family papers supplied by Rev. A. Gordon.] F. W–T.

EMLYN, HENRY (1729–1815), architect, resided at Windsor. He published 'A Proposition for a new Order in Architecture, with rules for drawing the several parts,' fol. London, 1781 (2nd and 3rd editions,

1784); this consisted 'of a shaft that at one-third of its height divided itself into two, the capitals having oak leaves for foliage, with the star of the order of the garter between the volutes.' He introduced this order (the point of division being covered by an escutcheon, and the foliage being replaced by ostrich plumes) in the tetra-style portico at Beaumont Lodge, near Windsor, erected, except part of the west wing, by him for Henry Griffiths about 1785 (Neale, *Views of Seats*, vol. i.), and in the porch of his own house. George III confided to him some alterations in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, which were executed (1787–90) entirely after his designs, and preserved a due harmony with the original work. The restoration included 'the screen to the choir, executed in Coade's artificial stone, with the organ case, the altar, and the king's and additional stalls.' Emlyn was elected F.S.A. 25 June 1795 ([Gough], *Chronolog. List of Soc. Antiq.* p. 58). He died at Windsor 10 Dec. 1815, in his eighty-seventh year, and was buried on the 19th in St. George's Chapel. A tablet was erected to his memory in the Bray chantry.

[Dict. of Architecture (Architect. Publ. Soc.), iii. 41; Gent. Mag. lxxxv. pt. ii. p. 573; Redgrave's Dict. of Artists (1878), p. 143; Georgian Era, iv. 502.] G. G.

EMLYN, THOMAS (1663–1741), first unitarian minister in England, was born at Stamford, Lincolnshire, 27 May 1663. The register of St. Michael's, Stamford, has the entry 'June 11th, Thomas, son of Silvester Embling and Mildred his wife baptz[d].' The family surname, which is spelled in thirteen different ways, is said to come from the tything of Embley, in the parish of East Wellow, Hampshire; but the Embleys or Emblins had been long settled as yeomen in the parish of Tinwell, Rutlandshire. Silvester, who originally spelled his name Emley, afterwards Emlyn, was admitted as a yeoman to scot and lot in Stamford, 28 Aug. 1651. He became a municipal councillor on 26 Aug. 1652, but was removed for nonconformity on 29 Aug. 1662. Though a nonconformist, and 'inclined to the puritan way,' he was a churchman in practice, and intimate with Richard Cumberland (1631–1718) [q.v.], then (1667–91) beneficed in Stamford. He was thrice married. His first wife, Katherine, was buried 25 April 1658; his second wife, Agnes (baptised 8 Nov. 1632), sister of the poet Dryden, died in childbirth, and was buried 13 Sept. 1660. On 26 Dec. 1661 he married Mildred (died 3 Dec. 1701), daughter of John Dering of Wicking, in Charing, Kent. He became a prosperous shopkeeper, acquired a small estate, and is entered as 'gentleman' in the record of his burial (15 March 1693). The family name is still preserved in Emblyn's Fields, Stamford.

Thomas, the only son who reached manhood, was sent in his eleventh year (August 1674) to a boarding-school at Walcot, Lincolnshire, kept by an ejected minister of foreign birth, George Boheme, younger brother of Mauritius Bohemus [q. v.] Here he attended the ministry of Richard Brocklesby (1636–1714) [q. v.], at the neighbouring church of Folkingham; if Brocklesby preached as he wrote, Emlyn was early initiated into strange doctrine.

Emlyn was placed in 1678 at the academy of an ejected minister, John Shuttlewood, then held in secret at Sulby, near Welford, Northamptonshire. He was dissatisfied with the few opportunities for reading presented by his tutor's scanty library, and paid a visit to Cambridge, where on 20 May 1679 he was entered (as 'Thomas Emlin') at Emmanuel, of which Dr. Holbech was then master. But he never came into residence, and remained with Shuttlewood till 1682. In August of that year he was transferred to the academy of Thomas Doolittle [q. v.], then held at Islington. In London he acquired a distaste for 'narrow schemes of systematic divinity.' He preached his first sermon in Doolittle's meeting-house on 19 Dec. 1682.

On 15 May 1683 he became domestic chaplain to a presbyterian lady, the widowed Countess of Donegall (Letitia, daughter of Sir William Hicks), who had a London house in Lincoln's Inn Fields. From her windows he witnessed the execution (18 July) of Lord William Russell. Next year he accompanied his patroness to Belfast, and continued to act as her chaplain after her marriage to Sir William Franklin. The presbyterian congregation of Belfast, of Scottish origin, had displeased the countess by the removal of an English minister and the appointment of Patrick Adair [q. v.] With this body Emlyn held no communion. He attended the parish church twice a day; when he preached at the castle in the evening, the vicar, Claudius Gilbert [q. v.] came to hear him. Bishop Hackett gave him, without ordination or subscription, a preaching license, 'facultatis exercendæ gratia;' he wore a clergyman's habit, and often officiated in the parish church. Franklin offered him a living on his estate in the west of England, but he objected to the terms of conformity. His engagement lasted till 1688, when the household was broken up by 'domestic differences,' as well as by the troubles which caused many protestant families to hurry from Ireland. It is

stated that Emlyn preached with 'pistols in his pocket.' Overtures were made to him (1 May) from the presbyterian congregation of Wood Street, Dublin, for whom he had once preached. In reply, Emlyn disposed of a rumour that he was 'intirely addicted to the church,' but declined to go to Dublin on the plea of business in England.

In the autumn of 1688 he left Belfast for London. Passing through Liverpool, he preached at St. Nicholas's for Robert Hunter, the incumbent, who took him for a clergyman, as he stood at the door of his inn. A second sermon at Liverpool (in August or September, just after Hunter's death) made the parishioners anxious to get him the living. He preached in other parish churches on his way, and reached London in December.

In May 1689 Emlyn became chaplain to Sir Robert Rich at Rose Hall, near Beccles, Suffolk. Rich, a lord of the admiralty, was a leading member of a presbyterian congregation meeting in a barn in Blue Anchor Lane, Lowestoft. At his desire Emlyn ministered at Lowestoft for about a year and a half, without accepting any pastoral charge. He was on good terms with John Hudson, the vicar, and took his people to charity sermons in the parish church. He was intimate with an old independent minister, William Manning, ejected from Middleton, Suffolk, and subsequently preaching at his own licensed house in Peasenhall. William Sherlock's 'Vindication' of the Trinity (1690) was read and discussed by Emlyn and Manning, with the result that Manning became a Socinian. He tried to convert Emlyn, keeping up a correspondence with him till his death (buried 15 Feb. 1711, aged 80). Emlyn's mind was not of the rationalistic order. He had supplied Baxter with circumstantial narratives of a ghost-story and of a case of witchcraft. Manning's influence brought him to a semi-Arian position, but no further. At what date he thus broke with established views is not clear; probably not till 1697, for on 18 Jan. 1697–8 he writes to Manning that he cannot hope to retain his charge, and is waiting for 'a fair occasion' to speak out.

The Dublin invitation had been renewed on 23 Sept. 1690, through Nathaniel Taylor of Salters' Hall, and accepted. In May 1691 Emlyn reached Dublin, and was ordained as colleague to Joseph Boyse [q. v.] His preaching was popular, avoiding controverted subjects, but puritanical in tone. On 4 Oct. 1698 he delivered a discourse before the societies for the reformation of manners, in which, while deprecating the 'prosecuting any for differences of judgment in religion,' he strongly advocated severe measures against vice and profanity, including sabbath-breaking. Among those attracted to his ministry was a churchwoman, Esther or Hester, younger daughter and coheiress of David Sollom, a quondam Jewish merchant, who had purchased (16 May 1678) the estate of Syddan and Woodstown in the barony of Slane, co. Meath. She had become, in her twentieth year, the widow of Richard Cromleholme Bury, a landed proprietor near Limerick, who left her a good jointure at his death (23 Nov. 1691). Emlyn married her in 1694 (license dated 10 July). On 13 Oct. 1701 she died, aged 29.

The 'fair occasion' for disclosing his views was brought about by the suspicions of Duncan Cumyng, M.D. (*d.* 8 Sept. 1724), an elder in his congregation who had been educated for the ministry. Cumyng noticed omissions in Emlyn's preaching, and interviewed him with Boyse in June 1702. Emlyn at once owned his heresy and wished to resign his charge. Boyse thought the matter must be laid before the Dublin presbytery, a body formed out of a coalition of presbyterians and independents. The ministers immediately resolved to dismiss Emlyn and silence him; subsequently, at the instance of his congregation, they agreed that he should withdraw to England for a time, but not preach. To this galling condition Emlyn would not bind himself. Next day he left for London, where he found friends, in spite of angry letters from Dublin. The Dublin divines engaged John Howe [q. v.] to talk him over, but without effect. Emlyn drew up and printed a paper containing his 'case,' which was met by a reply from Dublin, drafted by Boyse. A private letter from Boyse (3 Sept. 1702), very kindly written, advised Emlyn to seek some other engagement. On 16 Sept., at Cork, the Munster presbytery testified against his errors. After ten weeks' absence he returned to Dublin to settle his affairs, sold his books, and prepared to depart. Before doing so he put to press 'An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ.' It was printed off, and the dissenters were anxious to hinder it from getting abroad. Alarm had been excited by a Socinian tract, 'The Scandal and Folly of the Cross removed' (1699), with which Emlyn had nothing to do, though it seems to have been reprinted in Dublin. Two dissenters on the grand jury were eager to present the 'Inquiry;' one of them, Caleb Thomas, a baptist deacon, got a warrant from Chief-justice Pyne and seized the author with a part of the impression. There was some demur about accepting bail; the attorney-general (Rochford) was appealed to and gave his consent.

At the end of Easter term 1703 the grand

jury found a true bill against him for publishing a blasphemous libel. The trial came on in the queen's bench on 14 June. Publication was not proved, and there was nothing in a tract 'fairly and temperately written' (Reid) to support the charge of blasphemy. But the two primates and four or five other bishops had seats on the bench; Emlyn's counsel were browbeaten, and he was not permitted to speak for himself. Pyne in charging the jury told them 'if they acquitted him my lords the bishops were there;' the deliberations of the jury were cut short, and they brought in a verdict of guilty. Emlyn was committed to gaol, and ordered to be brought up on the 16th for sentence. In the interim the foreman of the jury (Sir Humphrey Jervis) visited him to express sympathy, as did Wetenhall, bishop of Kilmore. Rochford was for placing him in the pillory, but Boyse, who had proved his own orthodoxy in an answer to Emlyn's 'Inquiry,' made strenuous efforts to obtain a milder sentence, and got Emlyn to address a supplicatory letter to the chief justice. On the 16th, when Emlyn appeared, the solicitor-general (Brodrick) moved that he should be allowed to retract, but this he would not do. He was sentenced to a year's imprisonment, to be extended until he had paid a fine of 1,000*l.* and found security for good behaviour during life. Hoadly thus sums up the case: 'The nonconformists accused him, the conformists condemned him, the secular power was called in, and the cause ended in an imprisonment and a very great fine, two methods of conviction of which the gospel is silent.'

Emlyn was at first allowed to remain a prisoner in the sub-sheriff's house at his own cost. On 6 Oct. the chief justice ordered his removal to the common gaol, where he lay five weeks, in a close room with five others, till his health failed. On petition he was transferred to the Marshalsea by habeas corpus. Here he 'hired a pretty large room' to himself, and preached on Sundays to the debtors and a few of 'the lower sort' of his Wood Street flock. He employed himself in writing a couple of treatises, and publishing the funeral sermon which he had preached on the death of his wife. None of his dissenting brethren came near him except Boyse, who made repeated attempts to obtain a reduction of his fine. On the other hand, there was a clerical petition for a grant of it, to rebuild a parish church, and a petition from Trinity College to apply it in additions and repairs. At length one of his friends, Thomas Medlicote, got the ear of Ormonde, the lord-lieutenant, and the fine was reduced to 70*l.* Yet the primate of Armagh (Narcissus Marsh) demanded, as queen's almoner, a shilling in the pound of the original fine, and was not easily satisfied with 20*l.*, which was paid in addition to the 70*l.* Emlyn was released on Saturday, 21 July 1705. Next day he preached a farewell sermon (printed *Works*, iii. 115 sq.) to the debtors discharged with him by an act of grace. Immediately before his release the Ulster general synod (June 1705) for the first time made subscription to the Westminster Confession imperative upon all entrants to the ministry. On the other hand, the spirit of theological inquiry led to the formation of a ministers' club, known as the 'Belfast Society' (1705), which ultimately became the parent of the non-subscribing body. Emlyn usually visited Ireland at intervals of two or three years, and found 'the odium of his opinions beginning to wear off apace.'

He fixed his permanent abode in London. A small congregation of his sympathisers collected at Cutlers' Hall, formerly occupied by Thomas Beverley, 'the prophet.' Leslie, the nonjuror, protested vehemently against the toleration of this new sect. Complaint was made to Archbishop Tenison by Francis Higgins, a Dublin clergyman, but Tenison would not interfere. In June 1711 the lower house of convocation represented to the queen that weekly sermons were preached in defence of unitarian principles. After a few years the congregation died out, and Emlyn found all pulpits closed against him except at the general baptist church in the Barbican (Paul's Alley), for whose ministers, James Foster, D.D. [q. v.], and Joseph Burroughs [q. v.], he preached once or twice. Their liberality is the more remarkable, as Emlyn in his 'Previous Question' (1710) had made a radical onslaught on baptism. At length in 1726, on the death of the Exeter heretic, James Peirce [q. v.], his people looked towards Emlyn as his successor. But age was creeping over him, and he would not entertain the proposal.

With the doubtful exception of John Cooper of Gloucester (*d.* 1682) Emlyn was the first preacher who described himself as a unitarian, a term introduced by Thomas Firmin [q. v.] He maintains, however, that he 'never once' preached unitarianism, advocating his theology only through the press. His treatises are, as he says, 'dry speculations,' but his controversy with David Martin of Utrecht, on the authenticity of 1 John v. 7, has still some interest. Whiston revered him as 'the first and principal confessor' of 'old christianity.' He was chairman at the weekly meetings of Whiston's 'Society for Promoting Primitive Christianity' (started

1715) from 4 Jan. to 28 June 1717 (the final meeting). Robert Cannon [q. v.] introduced him to Samuel Clarke (1675–1729) [q. v.], with whom he became intimate. In 1731 he wrote some 'Memoirs' of Clarke, chiefly dealing with his opinions as brought out in conversation.

Emlyn's 'Meditations' and his manuscript remains convey the impression of strong domestic affections and unaffected piety. He lived at Islington, and was admitted to the communion at the parish church until Stonehouse, the rector, excluded him. Emlyn wrote to the Bishop of London (Gibson) desiring readmission, but without effect. After 1739 he removed to Hackney. A curious story is told by Archbishop Secker of Emlyn's paying a visit to Matthew Henry at Hackney, and taking up his hat and gloves on hearing what he considered cant.

Gradually disabled by annual returns of gout, Emlyn succumbed to a feverish attack on 30 July 1741. He was buried on 8 Aug. in Bunhill Fields; the inscribed tombstone has disappeared; the epitaph is given in the 'Memoirs' by his son, and (with slight variations) in the commonplace book mentioned below. James Foster preached the funeral sermon on 16 Aug.

Emlyn's will, dated 5 Sept. 1739, contains few legacies, and the residue of his small property he left to his sole surviving son, Sollom [q. v.], who had already, on his mother's death, come in for her estate. His eldest son had died very young in August or September 1701.

The portrait of Emlyn by Highmore came into the possession of the Streatfeild family (to whom Emlyn's grandson left property), and for nearly fifty years lay in a loft over offices at Limpsfield, Surrey. When it came to light again (1843) it was in a very bad state, and nothing is now known of it. It was engraved by Van der Gucht; the original plate is in the possession of Mrs. H. Linwood Strong.

Emlyn's 'Works' were collected by his son in 1746, 3 vols. 8vo, called the 'fourth edition,' but this refers only to the included 'Collection of Tracts' (1719, 8vo; 1731, 2 vols. 8vo; 1742, 2 vols. 8vo). His first publication was 1. 'The Suppression of Public Vice,' Dublin, 1698, 8vo (sermon on 1 Sam. ii. 30; see above). Among his other pieces are: 2. 'The Case of Mr. E—— in relation to the Difference between him and some Dissenting Ministers of the City of Dublin,' &c., London [August] 1702, 4to, Dublin, 1703. 3. 'An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Account of Jesus Christ,' &c., 4to, Dublin, 1702 (anon.; the printer, Laurence, swore 'he knew not whose writing it was'). 4. 'A Vindication of the Worship of the Lord Jesus Christ, on Unitarian Principles,' &c., 4to, 1706 (anon.; written 1704). 5. 'General Remarks on Mr. Boyse's Vindication of the True Deity of our Blessed Saviour,' &c. (written 1704; sent to England and mislaid; first printed in 'Works'). 6. 'Remarks on Mr. Charles Leslie's First Dialogue,' &c., 4to, 1708 (anon.; in this, anticipating Clarke, he calls himself 'a true scriptural trinitarian;' he wrote two other tracts against Leslie in the same year). 7. 'The Previous Question to the Several Questions about . . . Baptism,' &c., 4to, 1710 (anon.; answered by Grantham Killingworth [q. v.] and Caleb Fleming [q. v.]) 8. 'A Full Inquiry into the Original Authority of that Text, 1 John v. 7,' &c., 8vo, 1715 (the controversy with Martin lasted till 1722; each wrote three pieces). 9. 'A True Narrative of the Proceedings . . . against Mr. Thomas Emlyn; and of his Prosecution,' &c., 8vo, 1719 (dated September 1718); latest edition 12mo, 1829. 10. 'Sermons,' 8vo, 1742 (with new titlepage, forms vol. iii. of 'Works'). 11. 'Memoirs of the Life and Sentiments of the Reverend Dr. Samuel Clarke' (written 1731; first printed in 'Works'). Also controversial tracts against Willis (1705), Sherlock (1707), Bennet (1718), Tong and others (1719), Trosse (1719), and Waterland (1731). In 1823 Jared Sparks published at Boston, U.S., a selection from Emlyn's works, with memoir. Answers to Emlyn's positions were furnished by Stephen Nye (1715), J. Abbadie [q. v.] (1719), C. Alexander (1791), and Aaron Burr, president of the college in New Jersey (1791), on occasion of an American edition (1790) of extracts from the 'Humble Inquiry.'

In Dr. Williams's library, Grafton Street, Gower Street, London, is a small manuscript volume, originally the note-book of some unknown pupil of Doolittle's academy, and used by Emlyn and his son Sollom as a kind of commonplace book; it had been in the possession of Colonel Clement W. Strong (*d.* 1869). Portions of Emlyn's correspondence with Manning (1703–10) were preserved by the great-grandson of the latter, William Manning (*d.* 1825) of Ormesby, Norfolk, and were printed in the 'Monthly Repository,' 1817, p. 387 sq., 1825, p. 705 sq., 1826, pp. 33 sq., 87 sq., 203 sq., 333 sq.; the originals, which passed into the hands of the Rev. H. R. Bowles of Great Yarmouth (*d.* 1 Jan. 1830), have since disappeared.

[Emlyn's works, letters, and commonplace book, above; Foster's funeral sermon, 1741; Memoirs by Sollom Emlyn, prefixed to Works, also separately, 1746; Biog. Brit. (Kippis), 1793,

gives no new particulars; Wallace's Antitrin. Biog. 1860, p. 503 sq. is better (see also p. 495 sq.); Baxter's Certainty of the World of Spirits, 1691 (edition of 1834), pp. 33 sq., 83 sq.; Steele's Account of the State of the Roman Catholic Religion, 1715, pref. (see Hoadly's Works, 1773, i. 537); Whiston's Mem. of Clarke, 1741, p. 58; Whiston's Memoirs, 1753, pp. 121, 215, 318, &c.; Toulmin's Hist. View, 1814, p. 238; Secker's Letters to John Fox in Monthly Repository, 1821, p. 571; Christian Moderator, 1827, p. 69, &c. (corrected by Campbell's manuscript Sketches of the Hist. of Presbyterians in Ireland, 1803); Armstrong's Appendix to Martineau's Ordination Service, 1829, p. 70; Reid's Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland (Killen), 1867, ii. 476; Browne's Hist. Cong. Norf. and Suff. 1877, p. 528 sq.; The Reliquary, xvi. 75, &c. (gives extracts from various parish registers, by Justin Simpson); Picton's Extracts from Liverpool Municipal Archives, 1883–6; Hist. Mem. First Presb. Ch. Belfast, 1887, p. 108; extracts from marriage and baptismal registers of St. Michael's, Stamford, per the Rev. H. Macdougall; registers of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, per the Rev. G. Phear, D.D., Master; parish register of Lowestoft, per the rector; Irish Record Rolls, Chas. II, 2, 44, and marriage licenses, Dublin Prerogative Court, per Sir J. Bernard Burke; Emlyn's will and other family papers, kindly laid before the present writer by the late H. L. Strong, esq.; letter (7 Feb. 1843) of the Rev. Thomas Streatfeild, per G. Strong, M.D.; information from the Rev. C. W. Empson, Wellow, Hampshire, the Rev. J. G. Burton, Bewdley, Worcestershire, and Joseph Phillips, esq., Stamford.] A. G.

EMMA (*d.* 1052), called ÆLFGIFU, queen, the daughter of Richard the Fearless, duke of the Normans, by Gunnor, and legitimated by the duke's subsequent marriage with her mother (WILL. OF JUMIÈGES, viii. c. 36), is said to have been accomplished and beautiful, and is called the 'gem of the Normans' (HENRY OF HUNTINGDON, p. 752). She was married to King Ethelred [q. v.] or Æthelred the Unready in 1002. This marriage prepared the way for the future conquest of England by the Normans, and was held to give the conqueror some right to the crown (*ib.* p. 751; *Norman Conquest*, i. 332 sq.) She arrived in England in Lent, and adopted the English name Ælfgifu, by which she is generally designated in the attestations of charters, though she is also called Emma, and sometimes by both names (FLOR. WIG. i. 156; *A.-S. Chron.*, Canterbury, sub an. 1013; *Codex. Dipl.* 719, 728 sq.) Winchester and other cities and jurisdictions, or rather the profits of them, were assigned her as her 'morning gift.' Among these was Exeter, where she appointed as her reeve a Frenchman, or Norman, named Hugh, who betrayed the city to the Danes. Her marriage with Æthelred was certainly not a happy one, and the king is said to have been unfaithful to her. She bore him two sons, Eadward, called the Confessor, and Ælfred [q. v.] When Sweyn conquered England in 1013 she took refuge with her brother, Duke Richard the Good. She was attended in her flight by Ælfsige, abbot of Peterborough, and appears to have left her sons in England, and to have been joined by them in Normandy (*A.-S. Chron.* sub an. 1013). After the death of Sweyn she probably returned to England with her husband, who died 23 April 1016. She is said to have defended London when it was besieged by Cnut in the May of that year [see under CANUTE]. In July 1017 she was married to Cnut, after having obtained his assent to her stipulation that the kingdom should descend to her son by him should she bear him one (*Enc. Emmæ*, ii. 16). She is said to have extended the dislike she felt towards her English husband to the sons she had by him (*Gesta Regum*, ii. 196); she was much attached to Cnut, and evidently wished that her English marriage should as far as possible be forgotten. Indeed her encomiast, when speaking of her marriage with Cnut, goes so far as to call her 'virgo.' Like her Danish husband she gave many gifts to monasteries, and especially enriched the Old Minster at Winchester. She and her little son Harthacnut, whom she bore to Cnut, were present at the translation of Archbishop Ælfheah in 1023, and she is said, on exceedingly doubtful authority, to have joined her brother Richard in mediating between her husband and Malcolm of Scotland (RUDOLF GLABER, ii. 2). When Cnut died in 1035 she and Earl Godwine strove to procure the kingship for her son Harthacnut, who was then in Denmark. Harold, one of Cnut's sons by an earlier connection, opposed them, and caused all Emma's treasures at Winchester to be seized. The kingdom was divided; Harold became king north of the Thames, while Harthacnut was acknowledged in Wessex, and as he remained absent Emma and Earl Godwine ruled for him. Cnut's housecarls were faithful to his widow (*A.-S. Chron.*, Peterborough, sub. ann. 1036). When one or both of her sons by Æthelred attempted to gain the kingdom in 1036, Emma appears to have favoured their enterprise. Ælfred was on his way to Winchester to see her when he was set upon by his enemies, and when she heard of his fate she sent Eadward, who is said to have been with her, back to Normandy (*A.-S. Chron.*, Abingdon and Worcester; FLOR. WIG. i. 196). The foolish legend that accuses her of complicity in the murder of Ælfred and of an attempt to poison Eadward is not worth discussion (*Ann.*

Winton. ii. 17, 22; BROMPTON, col. 934 sq.; *Norman Conquest*, i. 544). The author of the 'Encomium Emmæ,' who wrote for the queen's gratification, and who accordingly ignores her earlier marriage altogether, and speaks of the æthelings as if they were her sons by Cnut, says that Harold, in order to get them into his power, wrote a letter to them in their mother's name, complaining that she was deprived of power, and requesting that one of them would come over secretly and give her advice (*Enc. Emmæ*, iii. 3). That her favourite son Harthacnut was nominally king in Wessex, that Godwine had been in favour of his candidature, and that she was acting as regent for him, are not facts that make it unlikely that Emma should have been anxious for the success of the æthelings. Her power was rapidly passing away, for people became impatient of Harthacnut's prolonged absence; she saw the cause of her enemy Harold daily gaining ground; Earl Godwine was probably already inclined to go over to his side, and, whether the story of the forged letter is true or not, the letter as we have it probably states no more than the truth as regards the decay of her authority (for a different view see *Norman Conquest*, i. 553). In the course of the next year Wessex accepted Harold as king, and forsook Harthacnut, and before the winter Emma was banished 'without any mercy,' words which may perhaps imply that no time was allowed her to collect her goods (*A.-S. Chron.*, Worcester). She sought shelter at the court of Baldwin V, count of Flanders, the son of one of her nieces, a daughter of Richard the Good, and the husband of Adela, who had been betrothed to her nephew Richard III. He received her hospitably, and maintained her at Bruges (*ib.*; *Enc. Emmæ*, iii. 7). She is said to have sent messengers to her son Eadward asking him to help her, but according to the story Eadward, though he visited her, declared that he could do nothing for her. After he had returned to Normandy she is said to have applied to Harthacnut, who certainly in 1039 prepared to assert his claim to the English throne, sailed with a few ships to Flanders, and remained with her during the winter (*Enc. Emmæ*, iii. 8 sq.) In June 1040, after the death of Harold, she returned to England with Harthacnut, and appears to have held a position of considerable influence during his short reign (*Hist. Rames.* p. 151). One of the earliest acts of Eadward after he became king was to despoil her of her wealth. In November 1043 he rode from Gloucester, where he seems to have been holding some council, in company with Earls Godwine, Leofric, and Siward, appeared suddenly at Winchester, and seized all her treasure, 'because she had done less for him than he would both before he became king and also since' (*A.-S. Chron.*, Worcester). Whatever the exact cause may have been for this act, it seems to prove that the relations between her and Eadward were not such as would make it probable that she had applied to him for help before she sent to Harthacnut. As the seizure of her goods was approved by the three great earls, it is not unlikely that, faithful to her old feelings in favour of the Danish line, she had countenanced the partisans of Sweyn of Denmark (*Norman Conquest*, ii. 58–62). Enough was left her for her maintenance, and she was ordered to live quietly at Winchester, where the old palace was in the Conqueror's reign still called her house (*ib.* iv. 59 *n.*) After her disgrace she took no active part in public affairs, though, as in 1044 she witnessed two of her son's charters with reference to the church of Winchester (*Codex. Dipl.* 774, 775), some reconciliation probably took place between them. The legend that she was accused of unchastity, and cleared herself by the ordeal of hot iron, has no foundation of fact (it appears in *Ann. Winton.* ii. 21, and BROMPTON, col. 941, and is fully examined in *Norman Conquest*, ii. 368 sq.) She died on 6 March 1052, and was buried by her husband Cnut in the Old Minster at Winchester (1051, *A.-S. Chron.*, Abingdon, 1052, Worcester).

[Anglo-Saxon Chron.; Florence of Worcester (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Encomium Emmæ, Pertz; William of Jumièges, Duchesne; Henry of Huntingdon, Mon. Hist. Brit.; William of Malmesbury, Gesta Regum (Engl. Hist. Soc.); Hist. Ramesiensis (Rolls Ser.); Ann. Winton., Ann. Monastici (Rolls Ser.); Brompton, Twysden; Freeman's Norman Conquest, vols. i. ii.]

W. H.

EMMET, CHRISTOPHER TEMPLE (1761–1788), barrister, eldest son of Robert Emmet, M.D., and elder brother of Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet [q. v.], was born at Cork in 1761. He entered the university of Dublin in 1775, and obtained a scholarship there in 1778. He was called to the bar in Ireland in 1781, and in that year he married Anne Western Temple, daughter of Robert Temple, an American loyalist who had settled in Ireland. Emmet attained eminence as an advocate; he possessed a highly poetical imagination, remarkably retentive memory, and a vast amount of acquired knowledge of law, divinity, and literature. Under the chancellorship of Lord Lifford, Emmet was advanced to the rank of king's counsel in 1787. His death occurred in February 1788, while he was on circuit in

the south of Ireland, and his widow died in the following November. The only known writings of Emmet are a short poem on the myrtle and other trees, and an allegory of thirty-two stanzas of four lines each, entitled 'The Decree.' The latter was written during the administration of, and inscribed to, the Earl of Buckinghamshire, viceroy of Ireland from 1777 to 1780. In these verses the author predicted that the future eminence of England would be imperilled if she delayed to act justly towards Ireland by annulling harsh laws, and by removing the enactments which prohibited commerce between the Irish and America, which he styled 'the growing western world.'

[R. R. Madden's United Irishmen, 1860; Life of Grattan, vol. iv. (1840); manuscripts of Hon. Society of King's Inns, Dublin; Hibernian Magazine, 1788; Collection of Poems, 1789–90.]

J. T. G.

EMMET, ROBERT (1778–1803), United Irishman, third and youngest son of Dr. Robert Emmet, physician to the viceroy in Ireland, was born in Dublin in 1778. After being educated at several private schools in Dublin, he entered Trinity College on 7 Oct. 1793, and greatly distinguished himself there by winning prizes and by his eloquence in the Historical Society. A fellow student, Thomas Moore, the poet, describes his oratory as of the loftiest and most stirring character. His politics were, as might have been expected from the brother of Thomas Addis Emmet [q. v.], violently nationalist, but his youth prevented him from having any weight in the councils of the society of United Irishmen. He was, however, one of the leaders of that party among the students of Trinity College, and he was one of the nineteen ringleaders pointed out to Lord Clare and Dr. Duigenan during their famous visitation held in February 1798, for the purpose of testing the extent of the sympathy exhibited by the students for the United Irishmen. When summoned before the visitors, Emmet took his name off the college books. This turn of events put an end to his thoughts of a professional career, but he continued to take the keenest interest in politics, and in 1800 visited his brother, a prisoner at Fort St. George, and discussed with him the expediency of a rising in Ireland. He then travelled on the continent, visiting Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Spain; he met his brother after his release at Brussels and studied books on military science. In 1802 he had interviews with Napoleon and Talleyrand. The former promised to secure Irish independence, but Emmet doubted his sincerity. Emmet returned to Dublin in October 1802 with his mind made up on the subject. He had no combined plan like that of the United Irishmen of 1798; he had little hope of military help from France, although Napoleon had promised to invade England in August 1803; he seems indeed to have laid his plans without expecting them to be successful. He had 3,000*l.* of his own, and 1,400*l.* was advanced him by a Mr. Long, and with this money he purchased a few stand of arms, forged pikes, and collected a few desperate or ignorant conspirators. His father's death in December 1802 gave increased opportunities for pursuing his plans. In the spring he formed depôts of arms at Irishtown, in Patrick Street, and at Marshalsea Lane, where forty men were employed in manufacturing weapons of war. He printed proclamations and a scheme of national government which should guarantee life and property and religious equality. An explosion in the Patrick Street depôt on 16 July hastened his plans. He took up his residence in Marshalsea Lane and prepared for an immediate outbreak. The details of the plot were precisely similar to those of Despard's in London, with which it had probably some connection [see DESPARD, EDWARD MARCUS]. Emmet resolved to seize Dublin Castle, Pigeon House Fort, and the person of the viceroy, who was to be held as a hostage. What to do next Emmet does not seem to have determined, and he certainly made no attempt to get the feeling of the country on his side. On Saturday, 23 July 1803, the projected rising took place. A few men came in from Kildare and Wexford, others were at Broadstone, but all were without orders. At nine o'clock in the evening Emmet, dressed in a green coat, white breeches, and a cocked hat with feathers, together with a hundred wild followers, marched from Marshalsea Lane in utter disarray; they came across the carriage of Lord Kilwarden on its way to the castle, and murdered the old man with their pikes. Emmet was disheartened by this violence, and hastened to Rathfarnham. His followers assassinated Colonel Brown of the 4th regiment, whom they met on the Coombe. At the castle all was consternation; the Irish military authorities seemed in despair, and ordered the general assembly of all the troops in garrison; but before they had collected, and while the officials were in despair, news arrived that the ordinary guard had turned out and had easily dispersed the rioters. Emmet fled from Rathfarnham to the Wicklow mountains with a few friends. Anne Devlin, a daughter of his servant, brought him letters, and he returned with her in order to take

leave of Sarah Curran, to whom he was engaged to be married, before escaping to France. His hiding-place was transferred to Harold's Cross, and there he was arrested by Major Sirr, the capturer of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, on 25 Aug. 1803. He was tried on 19 Sept. before a special court, consisting of Lord Norbury and Barons George and Daly, and though defended by Ball, Burrowes, and M'Nally, he was condemned to death, and hanged upon the following day. He made a thrilling speech before receiving sentence, and also spoke from the scaffold. The youth and ability of Emmet have cast a glamour of romance over his career, and that glamour has been enhanced by his affection for Sarah Curran, the daughter of the great lawyer, to whom Moore addressed his famous poem, 'She is far from the land where her young hero sleeps;' the lady afterwards (24 Nov. 1805) married a very distinguished officer, Major Sturgeon of the royal staff corps. Emmet was first interred in Bully's Acre near Kilmainham Hospital, and his remains are said to have been afterwards removed either to St. Michan's churchyard or to Glasnevin cemetery. An uninscribed tombstone in each burial-place is now pointed out as marking his grave.

[There are many biographies of Emmet, but far the best is that contained in Madden's Lives of the United Irishmen, 3rd ser. vol. iii.; see also W. H. Curran's Life of John Philpot Curran, and Moore's Diaries.] H. M. S.

EMMET, THOMAS ADDIS (1764-1827), United Irishman, second son of Dr. Robert Emmet, physician to the viceroy in Ireland, was born at Cork on 24 April 1764. From his school days he gave evidence of brilliant abilities, and gained a scholarship at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1781. He took the degree of B.A. there in 1783, and then, as he had selected the medical profession, he proceeded to Edinburgh University, where the medical school was at that time most famous. While sedulously working at his own studies, he yet paid much attention to other subjects, became a friend of Mackintosh, a favourite pupil of Dugald Stewart, and president of no less than five debating and other societies among his fellow-students. After taking his M.D. degree at Edinburgh he visited many of the chief medical schools of England, France, Germany, and Italy, and was on his way home from the continent when he heard of the sudden death of his elder brother, Temple Emmet, a young Irish barrister of great promise. Thomas Emmet then determined to abandon medicine and follow in his brother's steps, and, after taking the degree of LL.B. at Trinity College, Dublin, he went to London to read law under the direction of Mackintosh. He was called to the Irish bar in Michaelmas term 1790, and married Jane, daughter of the Rev. John Patten of Clonmel, in the following year. He then commenced his active political life. Dr. Emmet had brought up all his three sons with the most advanced nationalist ideas, and Thomas was the first to put them into execution. His first brief was in the case of Napper Tandy *v.* Lord Westmorland, on the question of the lord-lieutenant's patent. In September 1793 he made himself conspicuous by his defence of O'Driscoll, who was put on his trial for sedition at Cork. He was soon recognised from his eloquence and learning as the leading Irish nationalist barrister, and by 1795, when he took the bold step of taking the oath of the United Irishmen in open court, he was making an income of 750*l.* a year at the bar. He was in that year elected secretary of the Society of United Irishmen, and in 1797 he succeeded Roger O'Connor as one of the directors. In the directory he showed more prudence than many of his colleagues, and with M'Cormick and M'Nevin he desired to wait for armed aid from France, and was opposed to the immediate rebellion advocated by Lord Edward Fitzgerald. Lord Castlereagh knew from his spies what was going on, and on 12 March 1798 all the directors were arrested at the house of Oliver Bond. Castlereagh had no desire to deal harshly with the Irish leaders, and when the insurrection was suppressed he agreed to allow the chief prisoners to go to America, and to stop all executions for treason if the prisoners made a full confession. Emmet agreed to this proposal, but Rufus King, the American minister, objected to the despatch of the rebels to the United States, and Emmet, Roger O'Connor, Nielson, and seventeen other leaders were therefore transferred to Fort St. George in Scotland on 26 March 1799. Mrs. Emmet joined her husband in 1800, and they remained there, though not in close confinement, until 1802, when with the other prisoners they were sent to Holland. Emmet was at Paris when he heard the news of his brother Robert's rising and death, and he had an interview with Napoleon on the subject in September 1803. He assisted MacSheehy in his scheme for raising a battalion of Irish in the pay of France, but he did not himself join it, and left France in 1804 for the United States. He joined the New York bar, where he soon took a leading position and made a large income. He continued prosperous until the day of his death, which took place very suddenly while pleading in court at New

York on 14 Nov. 1827, and he was buried in the churchyard of St. Mark's, Broadway, in that city.

[Haynes's Memoirs of Thomas Addis Emmett, 1829; Madden's United Irishmen, 3rd ser. vol. iii.; Webbe's Biography of Remarkable Irishmen.] H. M. S.

EMMETT, ANTHONY (1790–1872), major-general royal engineers, after passing through the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, received his commission as second lieutenant in the royal engineers on 16 Feb. 1808. He joined the army in the Peninsula early in 1809, and remained with it until the summer of 1812, when he was sent to England for recovery from the effects of a very severe wound received while leading on one of the columns to the assault of Badajoz in April 1812. He returned to the army in October of the following year at his own request, and remained with it to the close of the war. During his service in the Peninsula he was constantly before the enemy. First, in Abrantes and skirmishes near it, while the French were in front of the lines of Lisbon; secondly, at both the sieges of Badajoz in 1811, at the cavalry affair of Elboden, and in the trenches before Ciudad Rodrigo; and thirdly, at the siege of Badajoz in 1812, when he led on the Portuguese column of the 4th division to the assault of the breach of the curtain, and was severely wounded. He was shortly after sent to England for the restoration of his health. Prior to the siege he was occupied in improving the navigation of the Upper Douro to facilitate the transfer of supplies for the operations in Badajoz. On rejoining the army as a captain in 1813 he was employed in the examination of the fords of the Nive, held by the enemy's posts prior to the successful passage of that river. During the following campaign he was attached to the 2nd division, and was present at the battle of St. Pierre, near Bayonne, at the attack on the heights of Garres St.-Palais at Tarbes, and at the battles of Orthes and Toulouse. Soon after his return to England he was sent, in 1815, with General Keane, on the expedition against New Orleans, landed with the advance, and was present in the attack of the Americans, also at the assault made on the enemy's lines and at the siege of Fort Bowyer.

He was next appointed commanding royal engineer at St. Helena, whither he went with Sir Hudson Lowe, and held the command until after the death of Napoleon. He held various commands at home, at Bermuda, and in the Mediterranean, until he was compelled to retire as a major-general on account of bad health brought on by the wounds he received in the Peninsula. He was awarded the war medal and four clasps. He died at Brighton on 27 March 1872.

[Official Records; Corps Papers.] R. H. V.

EMPSON or **EMSON**, SIR RICHARD (*d.* 1510), statesman and lawyer, was son of Peter Empson of Towcester, Northamptonshire, and Elizabeth, his wife. The father, who died in 1473, is invariably described as a sievemaker in order to emphasise the son's humble origin; but Peter Empson was clearly a person of wealth and influence in Towcester, whatever his occupation. Richard was educated for the bar and rapidly distinguished himself as a common lawyer. As early as 1476 he purchased estates in Northamptonshire. He not only represented his county in the parliament that met 17 Oct. 1491, but was chosen speaker and served the office till the dissolution in the following March. His name appears among the collectors of the subsidy of 1491 for Lindsey, Lincolnshire (RYMER, *Fœdera*, xii. 448). He was recorder of Coventry, was knighted 18 Feb. 1503–4, and in 1504 was nominated high steward of Cambridge University and chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster. On 5 Aug. 1507 he was granted land and tenements in the parish of St. Bride in Fleet Street (WOOD, *Athenæ*, ed. Bliss, i. 13). From the opening of the reign of Henry VII Empson was associated with Edmund Dudley [q. v.] in the exaction of taxes and penalties due from offenders to the crown, and his zeal and rigour raised up a host of enemies. Henry VII always treated him with special favour, and made him an executor under his will; but the death of Henry VII left him without a protector, and Henry VIII, yielding to popular clamour, committed him and Dudley to the Tower. First brought before the council and charged with tyrannising over the king's subjects as collector of taxes and fines, Empson defended himself in a temperate speech, insisting that his conduct was legal throughout (HERBERT). A charge of constructive treason was subsequently drawn up against him and Dudley. It was asserted that they had compassed Henry VIII's death, because their friends had been under arms during Henry VII's illness. Empson was tried and convicted at Northampton 1 Oct. 1509; was attainted by parliament 21 Jan. 1509-10, and was executed with Dudley on Tower Hill 17 Aug. 1510. He was buried in the church of Whitefriars. Bacon describes Empson as brutal in his manners. Camden tells the story that Empson, while chaffing a blind man, reputed to be a sure prognosticator of changes of weather, asked 'When doth the

sun change?' The blind man replied, 'When such a wicked lawyer as you goeth to heaven' (Camden, *Remains*, 1870, p. 296). His wife Jane survived him. To his elder son, Thomas, his father's estates were restored by act of parliament 4 Hen. VIII. A younger son was named John. Of four daughters Elizabeth married (1) George Catesby, (2) Sir Thomas Lucy; Joan married (1) Henry Sothill, and (2) Sir William Pierrepoint; a third daughter became the wife of a gentleman named Tyrrell; and Jane married (1) John Pinshon, and (2) Sir Thomas Wilson, Queen Elizabeth's well-known secretary of state. Empson is stated by Stow to have resided in St. Swithin's Lane in the house adjoining Dudley's, and communicating with Dudley's residence through the garden.

[Cooper's Athenæ Cantabr. i. 14, 523; Manning's Speakers; Herbert's Henry VIII; Bacon's Henry VII; Baker's Northamptonshire; Metcalfe's Knights, p. 39; Stow's Survey of London; State Trials, i. 283–8; Brewer's Henry VIII, i. 69–70; art. supra 'Edmund Dudley.'] S. L. L.

EMPSON, WILLIAM (1791–1852), editor of the 'Edinburgh Review,' was educated at Winchester, where he was a schoolfellow of Thomas Arnold, afterwards head-master of Rugby, and at Trinity College, Cambridge. He graduated B.A. 1812, and M.A. 1815. He began to contribute to the 'Edinburgh Review' in 1823, and between that date and 1849 wrote in it more than sixty articles upon law, politics, and literary topics. There is an interesting account of two articles upon Goethe's 'Faust' and 'Correspondence with Schiller' (1830 and 1831) in Carlyle's 'Correspondence' with Goethe (1887, pp. 255, 282). In October 1843 he wrote an article upon Bentham, in which his reliance upon certain statements of Bowring produced a contradiction from J. S. Mill, published in the 'Review' for January 1844. In January 1845 he wrote upon Dr. Arnold, with whose views upon educational and ecclesiastical questions he thoroughly sympathised. Other articles offended Bulwer and the irritable Brougham, who calls him a bad imitator of Macaulay. He was, however, a valued contributor under both Jeffrey and Napier. On 2 July 1824 he became professor of general 'polity and the laws of England' at the East India College, Haileybury, a chair which had been formerly occupied by Sir James Mackintosh. He was an intimate friend of his colleague, Malthus. On 27 June 1838 he married Charlotte, only daughter of Francis Jeffrey. He succeeded to the editorship of the 'Edinburgh Review' in 1847, upon the death of Macvey Napier [q. v.], who had succeeded Jeffrey in 1829. Empson is said to have been an excellent professor, and familiar with the laws of India. He was, however, more remarkable for his influence upon the moral and philosophical training of his pupils. He was much beloved by them, and when they heard that he had broken a bloodvessel in 1852, they spontaneously gave up their usual festival. He finished the examination in spite of his suffering, but died at Haileybury 10 Dec. 1852. There are many letters to him in Cockburn's 'Life of Jeffrey' and in Macvey Napier's 'Correspondence' which are highly creditable to his good feeling and sense.

[Gent. Mag. 1853, pt. i. pp. 99, 100; Cockburn's Life of Jeffrey; Selections from the Correspondence of Macvey Napier (1879).]

ENDA, or, in the older spelling, **ENNA**, Saint, of Arran (*fl.* 6th century), was son of Conall the Red, one of the chiefs of Oriel. His mother, Brig (the vigorous), was a daughter of Ainmire, chief of Ardciannachta, in the county of Louth. On the death of his father Enna was chosen chief of his clan, and at the urgent request of his followers he made a raid on some of his enemies, thus inaugurating his rule. Returning from the expedition and singing a song of victory, they passed by the hermitage of his sister Fanche. She warned her virgins of a heathen's presence. Enna approached her as she stood in the doorway, but she repulsed him. He urged that as holder of his father's heritage he must fight his enemies, and demanded as wife a royal pupil of his sister. St. Fanche offered the girl her choice to become the wife of the chieftain or else, as she expressed it, 'to love Him whom I love.' The girl chose to die to the world. The circumstance is described in the usual fashion of the lives as an actual death, and St. Fanche is represented as preaching to him in the presence of her dead body. He was so moved by her exhortations that he abandoned his wild life and became a monk. As an evidence of his zeal it is mentioned that he excavated a deep trench round his monastery with his own hands. While he was thus engaged, a hostile tribe, descendants of Criomthann, making a raid on Enna's territory, passed near his abode. They were pursued by the people of Oriel, and fighting took place near the cell of Enna. Then his old nature asserted itself, and he joined in the conflict, using a stake as a weapon. To avoid further temptation, and acting on his sister's advice, he crossed to Britain to Rosnat, and stayed with Mansen, who was master there. The place referred to has been shown by Dr. Todd to be the famous Candida Casa or Whithorne in Galloway, and the 'master' St. Ninian. In course of time he was ordained

presbyter, and collecting some followers he built a monastery called in his life Latinum. Colgan erroneously suggested that this was either Latiniacense in Gaul founded by St. Fursey, or Lætiense in Belgium, but these will not answer, and there can be no doubt that 'Latinum' stands for the Irish word 'Letha,' which originally meant, as it means here, Armorica or Brittany (called in mediæval usage Letavia), although it afterwards came to mean Latium or Italy. This explains the statement that his sister in going to visit him landed at a port in Britain, i.e. in Bretagne. With this correction the story of his visit and stay at Rome and of the pilgrims from Rome bringing tidings of his fame falls to the ground.

Enna on his return to Ireland landed at Inver Colpa, at the mouth of the Boyne, and engaged in missionary labours. But with the consent of Œngus, son of Nadfraoch, king of Munster, whose wife, Dairinne, was his sister, he soon took possession of the largest and most western of the islands of Arran, called afterwards Arran of the Saints, from the number of holy men buried there. The island had been occupied by heathen inhabitants from the mainland of Corcomroe in the county of Clare, all of whom fled except their chief, Corban. It is mentioned incidentally that a species of corn, *far*, had been introduced by divine interposition into the island, and was still to be found there in 1390, when Augustine Magraidin composed the 'Life' published by the Bollandists, from which these facts are taken. Enna founded ten monasteries in the island, but discussions arose about the division of the land. An angel is said to have brought him a book of the four evangelists and a casula or hood decorated with gold and silver, which were still preserved and held in the highest reverence in 1390. After one or two visits to the mainland and one to a chieftain termed Crumther Coelan or Coelan the presbyter, who lived in an island on Lough Corrib, Enna appears to have stayed at Arran for the rest of his life. He offered three prayers at the close of his life, one of which was that every contrite person who desired to be buried in the burial-ground of his monastery should have as a privilege 'that the mouth of hell should not be closed upon him.' The Bollandists, who do not consider this orthodox, explain that it means he should not suffer the pains of purgatory or be detained long there. The remains on the great island connected with St. Enna are Cell Enda, the parish church, Teglach Enda, where the saint is buried with 120 others (this is the privileged spot referred to in his prayer), and lastly, Tempoll mor Enda. So severe was the discipline at Arran that, in order to test the purity of the monks, St. Enna had a corrach or boat made without a hide, that is, consisting of framework and ribs only and no covering, into which each monk had to go every day, and if any water entered it he was thereby proved a sinner; 'thus he kept up their angelic purity.' Ussher assigns his death to 530 in the ninetieth year of his age, but he appears to have been alive up to 540, according to Colgan. Earlier than this he cannot be placed, as he belonged to the second order of Irish saints (542–599); but as the annals have no mention of his death, the actual year cannot be ascertained with any certainty. His day is 25 April.

[Bollandists' Acta Sanct. 21 March, iii. 269; O'Flaherty's Iar Connaught, pp. 77–9; Book of Hymns, Rev. J. H. Todd, i. 103; Colgan's Acta Sanct. p. 704 seq.; Ware's Antiquities, p. 249.]

T. O.

ENDECOTT, JOHN (1588?–1665), governor of New England, is supposed to have been born at Dorchester, Dorsetshire, in or about 1588, but nothing is known of his early life. On 19 March 1628 he joined with five other 'religious persons' in purchasing a patent of the territory of Massachusetts Bay from 'the corporation styled the council established at Plymouth in the county of Devon for the planting, ruling, and governing of New England in America.' Among those who almost immediately after the purchase secured proprietary rights in the 'Dorchester Company,' as it was called, and who became respectively governor and deputy-governor of the company in London, were Matthew Cradock [q. v.] and Roger Ludlow. Being related to both by marriage, it is probable that Endecott was selected at their instance as a 'fit instrument to begin the wildernesse-worke.' He was accordingly entrusted with full powers to take charge of the plantation at Naumkeag, afterwards Salem. Accompanied by his wife and some twenty or thirty emigrants, he sailed from Weymouth in the ship Abigail, 20 June 1628, and reached Naumkeag on 6 Sept. following. As a ruler Endecott lost no time in showing himself earnest, zealous, and courageous, but, considering the difficulties which he had to battle against, it is not surprising that he was occasionally found wanting in tact and temper. His conduct towards the Indians was always marked with strict justice. On making known to the planters who had preceded him that he and his associate patentees had purchased all the property and privileges of the Dorchester partners, both at Naumkeag and at Cape Ann, much discontent

arose. Endecott and his puritan council viewed with no favourable eye the raising tobacco, 'believing such a production, except for medicinal purposes, injurious both to health and morals,' while they insisted on abolishing the use of the Book of Common Prayer. The wise enactions of the company's court in London did much towards allaying these and similar disputes (cf. Cradock's letter to Endecott, dated 16 Feb. 1628–9, in Young's *Chronicles of Massachusetts*, pp. 128–37). To protect themselves against the Indians a military company was organised by the settlers and Endecott placed in command. His attention was next called to the illegal trading and dissolute ways of the settlers at Mount Wollaston, or Merry Mount, now Quincy. He personally conducted an expedition thither, 'rebuked the inhabitants for their profaneness, and admonished them to look to it that they walked better' (Winthrop, *New England*, ed. Savage, 1823, i. 34). 'In the purifying spirit of authority' he then cut down the maypole on which Thomas Morton, their leader, had been wont to publish his satires on the puritans, while his followers made merry around it in the carousals for which the sale of arms and ammunition to the Indians furnished the supplies. He also changed the name of the settlement to Mount Dagon. Endecott continued to exercise the chief authority until 12 June 1630, when John Winthrop, the first regularly elected governor, arrived with the charter by which the government of the colony was entirely transferred to New England. Endecott, who had been chosen one of his council of assistants, gave a cordial welcome to Winthrop, and a friendship began which lasted without a cloud while the latter lived (*ib.* i. 26). On 3 July 1632 the court of assistants, to mark their sense of his services, granted him three hundred acres of land situate between two and three miles in a northerly direction from the main settlement at Salem, afterwards known as his 'orchard farm' (Felt, *Annals of Salem*, 2nd edit. i. 178). In 1634 he was nominated one of the seven military commissioners for the colony. In September of this year a rumour reached the colony that the king had demanded their charter with the intention of compelling obedience to the ceremonies of the church as interpreted and enforced by Laud. Endecott, 'a puritan of puritans,' was strangely moved at the news. Inflamed by the fiery eloquence of Roger Williams he publicly cut out with his sword the red cross of St. George from the banner used by the train band of Salem for the reason, as he alleged, that the cross savoured of popery. The colony dared not refrain from taking cognisance of an act with which most of its principal men, including Winthrop himself, secretly sympathised. The matter was accordingly brought before the general court, and after due investigation 'they adjudged him worthy admonition, and to be disabled for one year from bearing any public office; declining any heavier sentence, because they were persuaded he did it out of tenderness of conscience and not of any evil intent' (Winthrop, i. 155–6, 158). For protesting against the harsh treatment of Roger Williams he was shortly afterwards committed, when, finding it useless to resist, he made the apology demanded, and was released the same day (*ib.* i. 166).

From this period Endecott seems to have acted in greater harmony with the other leaders of the colony. In 1636 he was reappointed an assistant, and was also sent, along with Captain John Underhill, on an expedition against the Block Island and Pequot Indians. Little save bloodshed was effected. During this same year his views concerning the hateful cross triumphed. Many of the militia refused to serve under a flag which bore what they regarded as an idolatrous emblem; and after solemn consultation the military commissioners ordered the cross to be left out. In 1641 Endecott was chosen deputy-governor, and was continued in office for the two succeeding years. In 1642 he was appointed one of the corporation of Harvard College. His increasing influence insured his election as governor in 1644. The following year, when he was succeeded in the governorship by Joseph Dudley, he was constituted sergeant major-general of Massachusetts, the highest military office in the colony. He was also elected an assistant, and one of the united commissioners for the province. Upon the death of Winthrop, 26 March 1649, Endecott was again chosen govenor, to which office he was annually elected until his death, with the exception of 1650 and 1654, when he held that of deputy-governor. Under his administration, especially from 1655 to 1660, the colony made rapid progress. His faults were those of an age which regarded religious toleration as a crime. As the head of the commonwealth, responsible for its spiritual as well as temporal welfare, he felt it his duty to scourge, banish, and even hang the unorthodox. Especially obnoxious to him were the quakers, of which sect two men were executed in 1659 and a woman in 1660. Long before this he had issued a formal proclamation against wearing long hair 'after the manner of ruffians and barbarous Indians,

dated 10 March 1649 (Hutchinson, *Massachusetts*, i. 142). To meet the necessities of the time he established in 1652 a mint, which, contrary to law, continued to coin money until the charter of the colony was abrogated in 1685. In 1658 the court granted him, 'for his great service,' the fourth part of Block Island. At this time he was also elected president of the body of colonial commissioners. In 1660 the court was asked to confirm a grant of land which the Indians, mindful of his just dealing, had presented to his eldest son John.

Soon after the Restoration the struggle began in Massachusetts to save the charter and the government. Endecott drew up, in the name of the general court of Boston, a petition to the king praying for his majesty's protection and a continuance of those privileges and liberties which they had hitherto enjoyed. The 'open capitall blasphemies' of the quakers and their incorrigible contempt of authority were also set forth (*Cal. State Papers*, Col. Ser., America and West Indies, 1661–8, pp. 8–10). Charles returned vaguely favourable answers, desired Endecott to make diligent search for the regicides, Whalley and Goffe, and ordered all condemned quakers to be sent to England to be dealt with there (*ib.* pp. 11, 27–8, 33–4, 55). In 1662 the king expressed his willingness to take the plantation into his care provided that all laws made during the late troubles derogatory to the king's government be repealed, the oaths of allegiance duly observed, and the administration of justice take place in the king's name. He further suggested that 'as the principal end of their charter was liberty of conscience' the Book of Common Prayer and its ceremonies might very well be used by those desirous of doing so (*ib.* pp. 93–4). In April 1664 the king thought fit to send four commissioners to the colony, but without the least intention or thought, so he declared, of violating or in the least degree infringing their charter (*ib.* p. 201). When, however, the commissioners proceeded to sit in judgment upon the governor and court, the latter published by sound of the trumpet their disapprobation, and forbade every one to abet such conduct. The commissioners had therefore to depart, threatening against the authorities of Massachusetts the punishment 'which many in England concerned in the late rebellion had met with.' Endecott addressed a strongly worded protest against this attempt to override their privileges to Secretary Sir William Morrice, 19 Oct. 1664, and again petitioned the king (*ib.* pp. 247–9). In his reply to the general court, 25 Feb. 1664–5, Morrice complained of Endecott's 'disaffection,' and stated that the king would 'take it very well if at the next election any other person of good reputation be chosen in his place' (*ib.* p. 282). Before the effect of this recommendation could be ascertained Endecott had died at Boston, 15 March 1664–5, aged 77, and was buried 'with great honour and solemnity' on the 23rd. Tradition assigns the 'Chapel Burying-ground' as the place of his interment, but the tombstone has long been destroyed, it is supposed by British soldiers during the American war. At the time of his death Endecott had served the colony in various relations, including the very highest, longer than any other one of the Massachusetts fathers.

Endecott was twice married. His first wife, Ann Gower, who was a cousin or niece of Matthew Cradock, died soon after coming to the colony, it is believed childless; and he married secondly, 18 Aug. 1630, Elizabeth Gibson of Cambridge, England, by whom he had two sons, John, born about 1632, and Zerubbabel, born about 1635, a physician at Salem. A portrait of Endecott, said to have been taken the year he died, is in possession of the family, and has been copied and often engraved. He and his descendants to the fourth generation wrote the second syllable of the name with 'e,' but the 'i' has prevailed since.

[Savage's Genealogical Dictionary of First Settlers of New England, ii. 120–3; C. M. Endicott's Life of J. Endecott, fol. 1847, of which an abstract (with portrait) is given in New England Historical and Genealogical Register, i. 201–24; Moore's Lives of the Governors of New Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay, 1851, pp. 347–66; Salisbury's Memorial in Proceedings of American Antiquarian Society, 1873, pp. 113–54; The Fifth Half Century of the Landing of J. Endecott at Salem (Essex Institute Historical Collections, 18 Sept. 1878); Hubbard's General History of New England (8vo, Boston, 1848); Young's Chronicles of First Planters of Massachusetts Bay, p. 13; Felt's Annals of Salem, 2nd edit.; Felt's Paper in New England Historical and Genealogical Register, xii. 133–7; Felt's Who was the First Governor of Massachusetts?; Winthrop's History of New England (Savage), 2nd edit. ii. 200–3; Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography, ii. 355; Johnson's Wonder-working Providences of Zion's Saviour in New England, bk. i. chap. ix.; Birch's Life of Hon. Robert Boyle, pp. 450–2; Joseph Smith's Bibliotheca Antiquakeriana, p. 168; Cal. State Papers, Colonial Ser. (America and West Indies), 1574–1660, 1661–8.] G. G.

ENFIELD, EDWARD (1811–1880), philanthropist, third son of Henry Enfield, town clerk of Nottingham, and grandson of

William Enfield, LL.D. [q. v.], was born at Nottingham on 15 May 1811. His eldest brother, William, was a leader in all philanthropic efforts at Nottingham. Edward entered Manchester College, York, as a literary student in 1826; he was contemporary with Samuel Bache [q. v.] and Sir Thomas Baker of Manchester. Through the influence of Lord Holland he was appointed one of the moneyers of the mint, and one of the most active members of this corporation, till, on the reorganisation of the mint in 1851, he retired with a pension. Henceforth he gave his time and energy to works of education and philanthropy. He was a member of the council and committee of management of University College, London (president of the senate from 1878), and of the council of University Hall, Gordon Square. From 1867 he acted as treasurer, and was the guiding spirit, of the University College Hospital; most of the sanitary and structural improvements in the hospital were due to his admirable supervision. As a unitarian dissenter he took a large share in the conduct of the unsectarian efforts for the elevation of the poor in East London, carried on by the domestic mission society of that body. In 1857 he was elected a trustee of the nonconformist endowments embraced in Dr. Williams's trust, and became a valuable member of the estates and audit committees. At the time of his death he was president of Manchester New College, London.

He died at his residence, 19 Chester Terrace, Regent's Park, on 21 April 1880, and was buried at Woking cemetery on 26 April. He was twice married: first, to a daughter of John Taylor, F.R.S., by whom he had one son; and secondly, to a daughter of Henry Roscoe of Liverpool, who survived him.

[Daily News, 23 April 1880; Inquirer, 24 April 1880; Times, 27 April 1880; these notices are reprinted in 'In Memoriam, Edward Enfield,' 1880; Roll of Students, Manchester New College, 1868; Jeremy's Presb. Fund, 1885, p. 217.] A. G.

ENFIELD, WILLIAM (1741–1797), divine and author, was born of poor parents at Sudbury, Suffolk, on 29 March 1741. His earliest instructor was the Rev. William Hextall, a dissenting minister, by whose advice he was prepared for the ministry, and sent, in his seventeenth year, to the Daventry Academy, then conducted by Dr. Caleb Ashworth. He was there educated as one of the alumni of the presbyterian fund. In November 1763 he was ordained minister of the congregation of protestant dissenters at Benn's Garden, Liverpool. In 1770 he succeeded the Rev. John Seddon as tutor in belles-lettres and rector of the academy at Warrington. That institution was from various causes in a declining condition, and it was dissolved in 1783. In the meantime he established a sound reputation as a divine and author, and the degree of LL.D. was conferred on him by the university of Edinburgh on 8 March 1774. His pastoral duties to the Cairo Street presbyterian congregation, which he had undertaken on first going to Warrington in 1770, were continued two years after the closing of the academy, and only relinquished on his receiving an invitation (in 1785) to the Octagon Chapel at Norwich. For some time after taking up his residence in that city he received pupils at his house, as he had done at Warrington, and among them were Denman, afterwards lord chief justice, and Maltby, subsequent bishop of Durham. Enfield was an amiable and estimable man, an influential writer and persuasive preacher, and was a leading figure in the literary society of both Warrington and Norwich.

He wrote: 1. 'Sermons for the Use of Families,' 1768–70, 2 vols. 8vo. 2. 'Prayers for the Use of Families,' 1770, 2nd edit. 1777. 3. 'Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Rev. Philip Taylor,' &c., 1770. 4. 'Remarks on several late Publications relative to the Dissenters, in a letter to Dr. Priestley,' 1770. To this Priestley replied. 5. 'The Preacher's Directory,' 1771, 4to, 2nd edit. 1781. 6. 'Hymns for Public Worship, selected,' 1772, 12mo, 2nd edit. 1781. 7. 'An Essay towards the History of Leverpool [i.e. Liverpool], drawn up chiefly from the papers left by the late Mr. George Perry,' 1773, fol., 2nd edit. 1774. 8. 'The English Preacher, or Sermons on the Principal Subjects of Religion and Morality,' 1773–79, 9 vols. 12mo. 9. 'Observations on Literary Property,' 1774, 4to. 10. 'The Speaker, or Miscellaneous Pieces selected from the best English Writers,' 1774. This very popular elocutionary book has often been reprinted. 11. 'A Sermon on the Death of Mr. J. Galloway,' 1777. 12. 'Biographical Sermons on the Principal Characters in Scripture,' 12mo. 13. 'A Sermon on the Ordination of the Rev. J. P. Estlin,' 1778. 14. 'A Funeral Sermon on the Death of the Rev. John Aikin, D.D.,' 1780. 15. 'Discourse on the Progress of Religion and Christian Knowledge,' 1780. 16. 'Exercises in Elocution,' 1780, 3rd edit. 1786. To an edition in 1794 he added 'Counsels to Young Men.' 17. A translation of Rossignol's 'Elements of Geometry,' 1781, 8vo. 18. 'Institutes of Natural Philosophy,' 1785, 4to, 2nd edit. 1799. 19. 'The History of

Philosophy . . . from Brucker's "Historia Critica Philosophiæ,"' 1791, 2 vols. 4to, 2nd edit. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo, new edit. 1840. 20. 'Sermons on Practical Subjects,' with portrait, and memoir by Aikin, 1798, 2nd edit. 1799. He contributed to the 'Cabinet,' published at Norwich, to the 'Monthly Magazine,' edited by Dr. Aikin, 1796, and to the 'Monthly' and 'Analytical' reviews, and wrote a number of articles for the first volume of Aikin's 'General Biographical Dictionary.' Several of his earlier works were translated into German.

He died at Norwich on 3 Nov. 1797, aged 56. His wife, whom he married in 1767, was the daughter of Richard Holland, draper, of Liverpool. His sons, Richard and Henry, were successively appointed to the office of town clerk of Nottingham.

[Aikin's Memoir, as above; also in L. Aikin's Memoirs of John Aikin, 1823, ii. 293; Monthly Repository, viii. 427; Taylor's Hist. of the Octagon Chapel, Norwich, 1848, p. 49; Memoir of Gilbert Wakefield, 1804, i. 223; Priestley's Works, vol. xxii.; Rutt's Memoir of Priestley; H. A. Bright in Trans. Hist. Soc. Lancashire and Cheshire, xi. 15; Kendrick's Profiles of Warrington Worthies, 1854; Kendrick's Eyres's Warrington Press in Warrington Examiner, 1881; Picton's Memorials of Liverpool, 1873, ii. 107; Palatine Note-book, i. 34, 53 (as to editions of the 'Speaker'); Allibone, i. 558; Bohn's Lowndes, iv. 739; Cat. of Edinburgh Graduates, 1858; Jeremy's Presbyterian Fund, and Dr. Daniel Williams's Fund, 1885, p. 63; Reuss's Alphab. Register of Authors, Berlin, 1791, p. 125.] C. W. S.

ENGLAND, GEORGE (*fl.* 1735), divine and author, was a member of the England family which flourished at Yarmouth, Norfolk, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and may have been a grandson of Sir George England. He was chaplain to Lord Hobart, by whom he was presented in 1733 to the living of Hanworth, Norfolk. In 1737 he resigned Hanworth to become rector of Wolterton and Wickmere, a consolidated living in the same county. He was the author of 'An Enquiry into the Morals of the Ancients,' London, 1737, 4to, a work based on the belief that the 'ancients,' by whom is understood the Greeks and Romans, were much superior in the practice of morality to christians in general.

[Blomefield and Parkin's Topograph. Hist. of Norfolk, vi. 452, 462, viii. 132.] A. V.

ENGLAND, GEORGE (*fl.* 1740–1788), organ-builder, built the organs of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, 1760; Gravesend Church, 1764; Ashton-under-Lyne, 1770; St. Michael's, Queenhithe, 1779; St. Mary's, Aldermary, 1781 (the last two in conjunction with Hugh Russell); besides those of St. Matthew's, Friday Street; St. Mildred's, Poultry; the German Lutheran Church, Goodman's Fields; the chapel of Dulwich College; St. Margaret Moses; and St. Alphege, Greenwich. 'These organs were remarkable for the brightness and brilliancy of their chorus' (Hopkins); that of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, a fine specimen of England's work, was repaired by Gray in 1825, rebuilt 1872, and considerably enlarged later by Hill & Son.

England married the daughter of Richard Bridge (another organ-builder) and was the father of George Pike England (1765?–1814), who left a list of the organs he built in an extant account book. They are those of: St. George's Chapel; Portsmouth Common, 1788; St. James's, Clerkenwell, and Fetter Lane Chapel, 1790; Warminster Church, and Adelphi Chapel, 1791; Gainsborough Church, Lincolnshire, 1793; Newington Church, Surrey, and Blandford Church, 1794; Carmarthen Church, 1796; St. Margaret's, Lothbury, 1801; Sardinian Chapel, 1802; Newark Church, Nottinghamshire, 1803; Sheffield Parish Church; St. Philip's, Birmingham, and St. Martin's Outwich, 1805; Hinckley Parish Church, 1808; Stourbridge; Richmond, Yorkshire; High Church, Lancaster, 1809; Shiffnall, Salop, and Ulverston, 1811; and St. Mary's, Islington, 1812. According to Warman, the organ of Durham Cathedral is ascribed to G. P. England, in conjunction with Nicholls, 1815.

[Rimbault and Hopkins on The Organ; J. W. Warman's The Organ and its Compass.] L. M. M.

ENGLAND, JOHN, D.D. (1786–1842), bishop of Charleston, was born in the city of Cork, Ireland, on 23 Sept. 1786, and educated in the schools of his native city. At the age of fifteen, having resolved to become a priest, he was placed by Dr. Moylan, bishop of Cork, under the care of the Rev. Robert M'Carthy, dean of the diocese, who prepared him to enter the college of Carlow in August 1803. During his stay in that institution he founded a female penitentiary and poor schools for both sexes, delivered catechetical lectures in the parish chapel, and gave religious instruction to the Roman catholic militiamen stationed in the town. He left Carlow in 1808, and returned to Cork to receive holy orders, for which Bishop Moylan had obtained a dispensation from Rome, England not having yet attained the canonical age. He was then appointed lecturer at the cathedral, and chaplain to the Presentation Convent. In May

1809 he began the publication of a monthly magazine called 'The Religious Repertory; being a choice collection of original essays on various religious subjects.' In 1812 he was appointed president of the diocesan college of St. Mary, in which he also taught theology; and about the same time he entered into politics and wrote and spoke vehemently against the proposal to give to the British government a veto on the appointment of catholic bishops.

In 1817 he was made parish priest of Bandon, where he remained until he was appointed bishop of Charleston, U.S., by a papal bull which was expedited from Rome 2 June 1820. He was consecrated at Cork on 21 Sept. and soon afterwards proceeded to his diocese, which comprised the states of North and South Carolina and Georgia, with a scattered catholic population of eight thousand and only four priests. One of his first cares was the establishment of an academy and theological seminary. He was also instrumental in forming an 'anti-duelling society.' He corrected many abuses which had crept into the church, visited every part of his vast half-settled diocese, and gave special care to the negroes, for whom he always had regular services in his cathedral. In times of pestilence he was untiring in his heroic devotion to the sick. He established the 'United States Catholic Miscellany,' the first catholic paper published in America. In January 1826 he visited Washington, and at the request of the president of the United States and the members of Congress he delivered a discourse before them in the Senate House.

In 1832 he visited his native country, and thence proceeded to Rome. He was sent by Pope Gregory XVI as legate to the government of Hayti. In the autumn of 1833 he proceeded on his mission, and he returned to Rome in the following spring to report the state of his negotiations before returning to his diocese. He made two more voyages to Europe in 1836 and 1841. Soon after his return from the latter visit he died at Charleston on 11 April 1842.

He was a man of great learning and high moral character, and his incessant activity won for him at Rome the sobriquet of *il vescovò a vapore*, 'the steam bishop.'

His 'Works,' collected and arranged by direction of Dr. Ignatius Aloysius Reynolds, his successor in the see of Charleston, were published in 5 vols., Baltimore, 1849, 8vo. These volumes are almost entirely occupied by essays on topics of controversial theology, many of which are in the form of letters originally published in various periodicals. A portion of the fourth and fifth volumes is filled by addresses delivered before various college societies and on public occasions, including an oration on the character of Washington.

There is a portrait of him, engraved by J. Peterkin, in the Irish 'Catholic Directory' for 1843. Another, engraved by J. Sartain, is prefixed to his collected works.

[Obit. notices prefixed to his works; Irish Catholic Directory (1843), p. 251; Ripley and Dana's New American Cyclopædia; Irish Quarterly Review, viii. 636; Duyckinck's Cycl. of American Literature (1877), i. 778; Windele's Guide to Cork (1849), p. 142.] T. C.

ENGLAND, Sir RICHARD (1793–1883), general, was the son of Lieutenant-general Richard England of Lifford, co. Clare, a veteran of the war of American Independence, colonel of the 5th regiment, lieutenant-governor of Plymouth, and one of the first colonists of Western Upper Canada, by Anne, daughter of James O'Brien of Ennistyen, a cadet of the family of the Marquis of Thomond. He was born at Detroit, Upper Canada, in 1793, and after being educated at Winchester entered the army as an ensign in the 14th regiment on 25 Feb. 1808. He was promoted lieutenant on 1 June 1809, and served in that year in the expedition to the Walcheren and in the attack on Flushing. He was employed in the adjutant-general's department in Sicily in 1810 and 1811, and served in the defence of Tarifa as a volunteer on his way to take up his appointment. He was promoted captain into the 60th regiment on 11 July 1811, and exchanged into the 12th on 1 Jan. 1812. In that year he went on leave to Canada to join his father, and after his death he returned to England, married Anna Maria, sister of Sir J. C. Anderson, in 1814, and in 1815 joined his regiment at Paris after the battle of Waterloo. He remained in France until the withdrawal of the army of occupation in 1818, and after serving as aide-de-camp to Major-general Sir Colquhoun Grant, commanding at Dublin from 1821 to 1823, he was promoted major into the 75th regiment on 4 Sept. 1823, and lieutenant-colonel of the same regiment, in the place of the Duke of Cleveland, on 29 Oct. 1825. He commanded this regiment for many years, and went with it to the Cape in 1833. Lieutenant-general Sir Galbraith Lowry Cole, who then commanded there, selected England on the outbreak of the Kaffir war in 1836 to command upon the eastern frontier with the rank of brigadier-general, and he served throughout the campaigns of 1836 and 1837 in this rank. For his services he received a medal, and was promoted colonel on 28 June

1838. In 1839 he was transferred to the command of the 41st regiment, and appointed to command the Belgaum district of the Bombay presidency as brigadier-general, and immediately on his arrival he lost his wife. From this place he was summoned in 1841 to take command of the Bombay division despatched to the relief of Colonel Palmer at Ghuznee and General Nott at Kandahar. He failed to reach Ghuznee in time, but, after one repulse, forced his way through the Pishín valley, and reached Kandahar in time to join Nott, and as second in command to that general assisted in the defeat of Akbar Khán on the Khojak Heights. He remained at Kandahar till the close of 1842, when it was decided to abandon that place, and he was then placed in command of the force which retired through the Bolan Pass into Sind, while Nott marched with seven thousand picked troops on Ghuznee and Cabul. It cannot be said that England had greatly distinguished himself during these operations. Nott complained greatly of him, and though he did what he was appointed to do, and had relieved Kandahar, his operations were not considered as successful as they might have been, and he had suffered reverses, which were very like defeats, from the Balúchís both during his advance and his retreat. Nevertheless he was made a K.C.B. on 27 Sept. 1843, and then threw up his command, returned home, and settled at Bath.

England remained unemployed until 1849, when he received the command of the Curragh brigade, and he was promoted major-general on 11 Nov. 1851. In 1854 the censure passed on his behaviour in Afghanistan seemed to be forgotten, and he was placed in command of the 3rd division in the Crimean expedition. At the battle of the Alma his division was not so severely engaged as the guards or the light division; but at Inkerman England was one of the generals first upon the scene of action, and though he was never in actual command there, his promptitude in sending up his troops at the critical moment to the assistance of the hard-pressed battalions on the Inkerman Tusk greatly contributed to the success of the day. It was during the trying winter of 1854–5 that England chiefly distinguished himself. He suffered the greatest privations with his troops, but yet he never applied to come home, and was the last of the original general officers who had accompanied the army to the Crimea to leave it. Before he did return he directed the attack on the Redan on 18 June 1855, and it was not his fault that the result of that day's hard fighting was not a great success. In August 1855 he was, however, obliged to obey the doctor's orders and return to England. For his services he was promoted lieutenant-general, and made a G.C.B., a grand officer of the Legion of Honour, and a knight of the first class of the Medjidie. England never again saw service. He was made colonel of the 41st regiment on 20 April 1861, promoted general on 6 July 1863, and placed on the retired list in 1877. He died at St. Margaret's, Titchfield, Hampshire, on 19 Jan. 1883.

[Times, 23 Jan. 1883; Hart's Army List; Nolan's Hist. of Crimean War, i. 405; for the war in Afghanistan, Kaye's History and Stocqueler's Life of Sir William Nott; for the Crimean war, Kinglake's Invasion of the Crimea.] H. M. S.

ENGLAND, THOMAS RICHARD (1790–1847), biographer, was younger brother of John England [q.v.], bishop of Charleston. He was born at Cork in 1790, and after taking holy orders in the Roman catholic church was appointed curate of the church of St. Peter and St. Paul in his native city. He became parish priest of Glanmire, and afterwards of Passage West, county Cork, where he died on 18 March 1847.

He published: 1. 'Letters from the Abbé Edgeworth to his Friends, with Memoirs of his Life, including some account of the late Roman Catholic Bishop of Cork, Dr. Moylan, and letters to him from the Right Hon. Edmund Burke and other persons of distinction,' Lond. 1818, 8vo. 2. 'A Short Memoir of an Antique Medal, bearing on one side the representation of the head of Christ and on the other a curious Hebrew inscription, lately found at Friar's Walk, near the city of Cork,' Lond. 1819, 8vo. 3. 'The Life of the Rev. Arthur O'Leary, including historical anecdotes, memoirs, and many hitherto unpublished documents illustrative of the condition of the Irish Catholics during the eighteenth century,' Lond. 1822, 8vo.

[Information from his nephew, Professor John England, of Queen's College, Cork; Windele's Guide to the City of Cork (1849), p. 142; Cat. of Printed Books in British Museum.] T. C.

ENGLEFIELD, Sir FRANCIS (*d.* 1596?), catholic exile, was the eldest son of Sir Thomas Englefield of Englefield, Berkshire, justice of the court of common pleas, by Elizabeth, daughter of Sir Robert Throckmorton of Coughton, Warwickshire. He succeeded to the inheritance on his father's death in 1537. He was high sheriff of Berkshire and Oxfordshire at the death of Henry VIII, and he was dubbed a knight of the carpet at Edward VI's coronation (Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 328, 8vo). He was one of the chief officers in the house-

hold of the Princess Mary. On 14 Aug. 1551 Robert Rochester, comptroller of the household, Edward Waldgrave, and Englefield appeared, in obedience to a summons, before the privy council at Hampton Court and received peremptory orders that mass should no longer be said in the princess's house. Being afterwards charged with not obeying these injunctions, they were committed to the Fleet, and on 31 Aug. sent to the Tower. On 18 March 1551-2 they were permitted to leave the Tower for their health's sake, and to go to their own homes; and on 24 April 1552 they were set at liberty, and had leave to repair to the Lady Mary at her request (*ib.* vol. ii. bk. ii. pp. 253-6, fol.)

On Queen Mary's accession Englefield was, in consideration of his faithful services, sworn of the privy council, and appointed master of the court of wards and liveries. He also obtained a grant of the manor and park of Fulbroke, Warwickshire, which were part of the lands forfeited by the attainder of John Dudley, duke of Northumberland. He sat in the House of Commons as knight of the shire for the county of Berks in every parliament held in Mary's reign (Willis, *Notitia Parliamentaria*, vol. iii. pt. ii. pp. 25, 40, 47, 54). He was allowed by the queen to have one hundred retainers. In January 1554-5 he was present at the trial of Bishop Hooper (Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, iii. 180, fol.) In May 1555 he was joined with others in a commission to examine certain persons who used the unlawful arts of conjuring and witchcraft, and in the following year he was in another commission which was appointed to inquire into a conspiracy against the queen. He often complained to Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, that Roger Ascham, secretary for the Latin tongue to Queen Mary, was a heretic, and ought to be punished on that account, or at least removed from his office, but the bishop declined to take any action, and remained a firm friend to Ascham throughout the queen's reign (Strype, *Life of Smith*, edit. 1820, p. 50; Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabr.* i. 265).

Being a firm adherent of the catholic religion, he fled abroad in 1559, soon after the accession of Elizabeth, and retired to Valladolid. His lands and goods were seized to the queen's use in consequence of his disobedience in not coming home after the queen's revocation, and for consorting with her enemies. On 18 Aug. 1563 he wrote to the privy council, expostulating and apologising on account of his conscience, which 'was not made of wax' (Strype, *Annals*, i. 409, fol.) In 6th Eliz., being indicted in the queen's bench for high treason committed at Namur, he was outlawed. Subsequently he was attainted and convicted of high treason in parliament on 29 Oct. 1585, and all his manors, lands, and vast possessions were declared to be forfeited to the crown. Englefield had, however, by indenture dated in the eighteenth year of the queen's reign (1575-6), settled his manor and estate of Englefield on Francis, his nephew, with power notwithstanding of revoking the grant if he should deliver or tender a gold ring to his nephew. Various disputes and points of law arose as to whether the Englefield estate was forfeited to the queen. After protracted discussions in the law courts the question remained undecided, and accordingly the queen in the ensuing parliament (35th Eliz.) had a special statute passed to confirm the attainder and to establish the forfeiture to herself. After tendering by her agents a ring to Englefield, the nephew, she seized and confiscated the property. By this arbitrary stretch of power the manor and estate of Englefield, which had been for upwards of 780 years in the family, were alienated and transferred to the crown. A full account of the legal proceedings in this remarkable case is given by Lord Coke in his 'Reports' (edit. 1777, vol. iv. bk. vii.)

After his retirement to Valladolid the king of Spain allowed him a pension; and a great part of the collections for the English exiles were dispensed by him and his friend Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Allen (Dodd, *Church Hist.* i. 530). On 8 April 1564 he wrote from Antwerp to the privy council, praying them to intercede with Elizabeth in his favour. He stated at great length his circumstances, the causes which had induced him to remain abroad, confuted the slanderous imputations against him, and supplicated the queen's forgiveness (*State Papers*, Dom. Eliz. vol. xxxiii. No. 99). In 1567 the king of Spain endeavoured without success to induce Elizabeth to allow Englefield the income of his estate, with permission to live abroad where he listed. The queen ordered her ambassador in Spain to inform the king that none of her subjects were disturbed for their religion if they were quiet in the state (Strype, *Annals*, i. 410, ii. 27, folio). It is asserted by Strype that the queen allowed Englefield the revenue of his estate in England, and retained only a small part of it for the necessary maintenance of his wife.

In a list of English exiles, about 1575, in the State Paper Office it is stated that 'Sir Frauncis Ingelfeld, knight, abideth commonly at Bruxelles; somme tyme he is at Machlin. He hath his owld pencion still, which he had beinge councellour in Q. Maries tyme, of the

K. of Spaigne, by moneth [no amount mentioned]. He rideth allwayes with 4 good horse' (*Douay Diaries*, p. 299).

He stood high in the estimation of his exiled fellow-countrymen. Thus Dr. Nicholas Sander, writing in 1576 to the cardinal of Como, classes Allen with Englefield as one of the two catholics whom it would be a mistake not to consult in all questions concerning England (Knox, *Letters and Memorials of Card. Allen*, p. 28). Englefield was engaged in January 1585–6 in corresponding with the pope and the king of Spain in behalf of the queen of Scots (*Cotton MSS.* Calig. C. viii. 277, C. ix. 406). In 1591 John Snowden, in a statement made to the English government respecting jesuits in Spain, says that Englefield 'has six hundred crowns a year, and more if he demands it, and is entirely one with the Cardinal and Parsons' (*State Papers*, Dom. Eliz. vol. ccxxxviii. art. 161). For many years he was afflicted with blindness. Writing in 1596 he remarks that more than twenty-four years had elapsed since he could write or read (Knox, p. 137).

On 7 May 1598 Thomas Honyman, one of Cecil's spies, wrote that 'postmasters in Spain weigh out the letters to their servants, and are easily corrupted for 28 ducats a month; the one at Madrid, Pedro Martinez, let me have all Cressold's and Englefield's letters, returning such as I did not dare to keep' (*Cal. of State Papers*, Dom. Eliz. 1598–1601, pp. 47, 48). Englefield died about 1596, and was buried at Valladolid, where his grave was formerly shown with respect to English travellers.

He married Catherine, daughter and heiress of Sir Thomas Fettiplace of Compton Beauchamp, Berkshire, but had no issue. The family was continued by his brother, John Englefield, lord of the manor of Wootton Basset, Wiltshire, whose son Francis was created a baronet in 1612.

[Dodd's Church Hist. i. 529, ii. 240; Douay Diaries, p. 421; Morris's Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers, iii. 26; Knox's Letters and Memorials of Card. Allen, hist. introd. pp. xxxii, xxxiii, 464; Sanders's Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism, p. 220; Panzani's Memoirs, p. 27 *n.*; Burke's Extinct and Dormant Baronetcies (1841), p. 184; Wootton's English Baronetage (1781), i. 125; Betham's Baronetage, i. 147; Addit. MS. 15950; Cotton MSS. Calig. C. ii. 56*, iii. 469, viii. 277, ix. 406; Harl. MSS. 295, art. 2, 3, 304 f. 68 *b*; Lansd. MSS. 18, art. 79, 96, art. 12; Foss's Judges of England, v. 160; Strype's Works (general index); Calendars of State Papers, Dom. Eliz. (1547–80) 733, (1581–90) 751, (1591–4) 614, (1595–7) 609, (1598–1601) 645, (1601–3) 621, (1603–10) 696, (1611–18) 558; Fuller's Worthies (Nichols), i. 109; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), ii. 74; Zurich Letters, i. 5; Clay's Liturgies &c. in Reign of Elizabeth, p. 656; Foxe's Acts and Monuments (Townsend), vi. 10, 22, 59, 576, vii. 34, 77, 85, 757, viii. 301; Burke's Commoners, ii. 646.] T. C.

ENGLEFIELD, Sir HENRY CHARLES (1752–1822), antiquary and scientific writer, born in 1752, was the eldest of the five children of Sir Henry Englefield, bart., by his second wife, Catharine, daughter of Sir Charles Bucke, bart. He succeeded his father in the baronetage 25 May 1780, but he did not marry, and the title became extinct. Englefield was elected a fellow of the Society of Antiquaries in 1779, was for many years one of its vice-presidents, and for a short time its president, succeeding Marquis Townshend. Under his direction the society published the series of engravings of English cathedrals and churches, Englefield himself contributing to the descriptive dissertations (1797–1813). He made ten or more contributions to the 'Archæologia' (vols. vi–xv.), principally on Roman antiquities and ecclesiastical architecture. He joined the Dilettanti Society in 1781, and was for fourteen years its secretary. He possessed a choice cabinet of vases, now apparently dispersed, formed from the Coghill, Cawdor, and Chinnery sales. The vases were drawn and engraved by H. Moses (*Vases from the Collection of Sir H. Englefield*, London, 1820, 4to; 2nd ed. 1848). He purchased Thomas Sandby's 'Views and Sketches of St. George's Chapel, Windsor,' at the Sandby sale in 1799.

Englefield was elected a fellow of the Royal Society in 1778. He made astronomical and other communications to it in 1781 and 1784. He also made scientific communications to the Linnean Society (vol. vi.), of which he was a fellow, and to the Royal Institution, and contributed to 'Nicholson's Journal' (vols. ix. x. xvi.), and to Tilloch's 'Philosophical Magazine' (vols. xxxvi. xliii. xlv.) His 'Discovery of a Lake from Madder' obtained the gold medal of the Society of Arts. His well-known 'Description of the Principal Picturesque Beauties, Antiquities, and Geological Phenomena of the Isle of Wight,' London, 1816, 4to and fol., was based on observations made in 1799, 1800, and 1801, when he spent the summer in the island, making notes, sketches, and measurements. His other publications are: 1. 'A Letter to the Author of the "Review of the Case of the Protestant Dissenters,"' London, 1790, 8vo (in this Englefield, as a Roman catholic, defends the principles of his community). 2. 'On the Determination of the Orbits of Comets,' &c., London, 1793, 4to. 3. 'A Walk through Southampton,' Southampton, 1801, 8vo and 4to (2nd ed.

with an account of Clausentum, 1805, 4to). 4. 'The Andrian' (verse translation from Terence), 1814, 8vo. 5. 'Observations on the probable Consequences of the Demolition of London Bridge,' London, 1821, 8vo.

Before his death Englefield suffered from (total or partial) loss of sight. He died at his house in Tylney Street, London, 21 March 1822, and was buried in the church at Englefield, near Reading. A house in Englefield, inhabited for several generations by his family, was sold by him in 1792. His friend William Sotheby testifies to Englefield's sunshiny temper and vivacious conversation. Charles Fox is said to have declared that he never left his company uninstructed. Englefield's portrait was painted by Sir T. Lawrence (engraved in Sotheby's 'Memorial'), and there are portraits of him in the 'Description of the Isle of Wight' and in the 'Gent. Mag.' (1822, vol. xcii. pt. i. p. 292). Two bronze medalets of him are in the British Museum (Wroth, *Index to English Personal Medals*, p. 12).

[Sotheby's Memorial dedicated to the Society of Dilettanti, 1822, 8vo; Gent. Mag. 1822, vol. xcii. pt. i. pp. 293, 294, 418 *f.*; Michaelis's Ancient Marbles in Great Britain, p. 161 and §§ 84, 90; Ann. Reg. 1822, lxiv. 276; Burke's Extinct Baronetage, 1844, pp. 183–5; Rose's New Biog. Dict.; Nichols's Lit. Illustr. v. 719, vi. 292, 307, 759, vii. 13, 17; Nichols's Lit. Anecd. iii. 112, ix. 475, 656; Brit. Mus. Cat.] W. W.

ENGLEHEART, FRANCIS (1775–1849), engraver, born in London in 1775, was nephew of George Engleheart [q. v.], and grandson of Francis Engleheart of Kew. He served as apprentice to Joseph Collyer the younger [q. v.], and subsequently became assistant to James Heath [q. v.] His first published engravings were some plates after the designs of Thomas Stothard, R.A., and he also engraved a large portion of 'The Canterbury Pilgrims,' which was completed and published by Heath. He became better known to the public by his engravings from the pictures and drawings of Richard Cook, R.A. [q. v.], and some of these were considered among the finest specimens of book illustrations then produced in England. He subsequently engraved the portraits in a collection of the works of the English poets, and was engaged by Messrs. Cadell & Davies to engrave the designs of R. Smirke, R.A. [q. v.], for works published by them. Engleheart engraved nearly thirty of Smirke's designs for their edition of 'Don Quixote.' His services were enlisted by Sir David Wilkie, R.A., to engrave his 'Duncan Gray' and 'The only Daughter,' which are the works by which Engleheart is chiefly known. His last important work was an engraving from the picture by W. Hilton, R.A., of 'Serena rescued by Sir Calepine, the Red Cross Knight.' Among other engravings by him were 'Cupid and the Nymphs,' after Hilton, 'The Holy Family,' after Fra Bartolommeo, some plates for 'The British Museum Marbles,' and numerous portraits and plates for the annuals then in vogue. Engleheart was a member of the Society of British Artists, and occasionally contributed to their exhibitions. He died on 15 Feb. 1849, in his seventy-fourth year.

Another member of the same family, Timothy Stansfeld Engleheart (1803–1879), was also an engraver. He engraved some of the plates in 'The British Museum Marbles,' but seems to have removed to Darmstadt, as there is a fine engraving by him of 'Ecce Homo,' after Guido Reni, executed at Darmstadt in 1840.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Ottley's Dict. of Recent and Living Painters; information from J. Gardner Engleheart, C.B.] L. C.

ENGLEHEART, GEORGE (1752–1839), miniature-painter, born in 1752, was one of the younger sons of Francis Engleheart, a member of a noble Silesian family, who came into England in the time of George II, and settled at Kew. Engleheart was a pupil of Sir Joshua Reynolds, and gained some repute as a miniature-painter, practising in Hertford Street, Mayfair. In 1790 he was appointed miniature-painter to the king. His miniatures were mostly executed on ivory, though occasionally on enamel, and were well drawn and coloured, showing great character and power. He exhibited at the Royal Academy between 1773 and 1812, mostly original portraits, or copies from Reynolds and others. Engleheart died at Blackheath on 21 March 1839.

His nephew, John Cox Dillman Engleheart (1783–1862), also practised as a miniature-painter. He first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1801, and continued to do so up to 1828, when, owing to failing health, he retired from his profession. He died in 1862. A collection of the works of both painters is in the possession of J. Gardner Engleheart, C.B., son of the last named; among the miniatures is a portrait of George Engleheart by himself.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; information from J. Gardner Engleheart, C.B.] L. C.

ENGLEHEART, THOMAS (*d.* 1787?), sculptor and modeller in wax, was one of the sons of Francis Engleheart of Kew, and elder brother of George Engleheart [q. v.] He was

a student at the Royal Academy, and in 1772 competed with John Flaxman [q. v.] for the gold medal given by the Royal Academy for a bas-relief of 'Ulysses and Nausicaa.' In this competition Engleheart was successful, to the bitter disappointment of Flaxman. He subsequently exhibited various busts and models in wax at the Royal Academy from 1773 to 1786, in which year or the following he died. There is in the National Portrait Gallery an oval medallion of Edward, duke of Kent, modelled in red wax by Engleheart in 1786.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Cunningham's Life of Flaxman; Royal Academy Catalogues; Cat. of the National Portrait Gallery; information from J. Gardner Engleheart, C.B.] L. C.

ENGLISH, HESTER. [See INGLIS.]

ENGLISH, SIR JOHN HAWKER, M.D. (1788–1840), entered the employment of the king of Sweden as surgeon, and became surgeon-in-chief to the Swedish army. In recognition of his services he was decorated with the order of Gustavus Vasa in 1813, and, having received permission to accept it, was knighted by the prince regent in 1815. On leaving Sweden he graduated M.D. at Gottingen 3 March 1814. He took the same degree at Aberdeen 26 May 1823, and was admitted a licentiate of the College of Physicians on 25 June following. He resided at Warley House, Essex, but at the time of his death, which occurred 25 June 1852, was staying at St. Leonards-on-Sea.

[Munk's Coll. of Phys. iii. 276; Gent. Mag. new ser. xiv. 221.] A. V.

ENGLISH, JOSIAS (*d.* 1718?), amateur etcher, was a gentleman of independent means who resided at Mortlake. He was an intimate friend and a pupil of Francis Clein [q. v.], the manager of the Mortlake tapestry works, and etched numerous plates in the style of Hollar, after Clein's designs; these include a set of eleven plates, etched in 1653, entitled 'Variæ Deorum Ethnicorum Effigies, or Divers Portraicturs of Heathen Gods,' a set of four representing 'The Seasons,' a similar set of 'The Four Cardinal Virtues,' and a set of fourteen plates of grotesques and arabesques. His most important etching was 'Christ and the Disciples at Emmaus,' after Titian. He also etched a plate of a jovial man smoking, dated 1656, portraits of Richard Kirby, John Ogilby, and William Dobson; the last named etching was long attributed to John Evelyn. There is in the British Museum a small mezzotint engraving by English. According to Vertue, English died about 1718, and left his property, which included a portrait of Clein and his wife and some samples of the Mortlake tapestry, to Mr. Crawley of Hempsted, Hertfordshire. His wife, Mary, who died 21 March 1679–80, was buried at Barnes, Surrey.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Walpole's Anecdotes of Painters; Vertue MSS. (Brit. Mus. Addit. MSS. 23068, &c.); Andresen's Handbuch für Kupferstichsämmler; Manning and Bray's Hist. of Surrey, iii. 322.] L. C.

ENGLISH, WILLIAM (*d.* 1778), Irish poet, was a native of Newcastle, co. Limerick. After teaching schools at Castletownroche and Charleville, he finally entered the Augustinian order. He died at Cork 13 Jan. 1778, and was buried in St. John's churchyard. As a Gaelic poet of humble life English acquired considerable reputation. His best-known ballad, 'Cashel of Munster,' has been well translated by Sir Samuel Ferguson in 'Lays of the Western Gael' (1865), pp. 209–210.

[Alfred Webb's Compendium of Irish Biography, where John O'Daly's Poets and Poetry of Munster (Dublin, 1853) is cited.] G. G.

ENSOM, WILLIAM (1796–1832), engraver, in 1815 gained a silver prize medal from the Society of Arts for a pen-and-ink portrait of William Blake [q. v.], poet and painter. He is best known by some small and neatly finished engravings from portraits by Sir Thomas Lawrence, including those of George IV, Master Lambton, Mrs. Arbuthnot, Marchioness of Salisbury, Lady Wallscourt, and others. He engraved 'Christ blessing the Bread,' after Carlo Dolce; 'St. John in the Wilderness,' after Carlo Cignani, and other subjects after Stothard, Smirke, Stephanoff, Bonington, and others; also plates for Neale's 'Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen,' and for annuals, such as the 'Amulet,' the 'Literary Souvenir,' &c. Ensom also painted in water colours, and was an intimate friend of R. P. Bonington [q. v.] He died at Wandsworth on 13 Sept. 1832, aged 36. His collection of engravings and drawings was sold by auction on 12 Dec. 1832. He occasionally exhibited at the Suffolk Street Gallery.

[Redgrave's Dict. of Artists; Graves's Dict. of Artists, 1760–1880; Le Blanc's Manuel de l'Amateur d'Estampes; Gent. Mag. 1832, ii. 284.] L. C.

ENSOR, GEORGE (1769–1843), political writer, was born in Dublin, of an English father, in 1769. He was educated at Trinity College, where he proceeded B.A. 1790. He devoted himself to political writing, and produced a large number of works in which very 'advanced' views in politics and religion are

advocated. He was widely read, and wrote in a powerful and sarcastic though sometimes inflated style. His attacks were specially directed against the English government of Ireland. He does not seem to have meddled, save with his pen, in political strife. 'I never was of any club, fraternity, or association,' he says (*Addresses to the People of Ireland*, p. 3). Bentham describes him as clever but impracticable. A large portion of Ensor's life was spent at Ardress, co. Armagh. There he died 3 Dec. 1843.

Ensor wrote: 1. 'The Independent Man, or an Essay on the Formation and Development of those Principles and Faculties of the Human Mind which constitute Moral and Intellectual Excellence,' 2 vols. 1806. 2. 'On National Government,' first part, 2 vols. 1810. 3. 'Defects of the English Laws and Tribunals,' 1812. 4. 'An Answer to the Speeches of Mr. Abbot, &c., on the Catholic Question, debated in the House of Commons 24 May 1813,' Dublin, 1813. 5. 'On the State of Europe in January 1816,' 1816. 6. 'An Inquiry concerning the Population of Nations, containing a Refutation of Mr. Malthus's Essay on Population,' 1818. 7. 'Radical Reform, Restoration of Usurped Rights,' 1819. 8. 'Addresses to the People of Ireland on the Degradation and Misery of their Country,' &c., Dublin, 1823. 9. 'The Poor and their Relief,' 1823. 10. 'A Defence of the Irish and the Means of their Redemption,' Dublin, 1825. 11. 'Irish Affairs at the close of 1825,' Dublin, 1826. 12. 'Letters showing the Inutility and exhibiting the Absurdity of what is fantastically called "The New Reformation"' [viz. the attempt to convert the Irish to the protestant faith], Dublin, 1828. 13. 'Anti-Union: Ireland as she ought to be,' Newry, 1831. 14. 'A Review of the Miracles, Prophecies, and Mysteries of the Old and New Testaments, and of the Morality and Consolation of the Christian Religion,' 1835. 15. 'Before and After the Reform Bill,' 1842. 16. 'Of Property, and of its Equal Distribution as promoting Virtue, Population, Abundance,' 1844. Ensor also wrote treatises on the 'Principles of Morality,' 'National Education,' 'The Catholic Question,' 'No Veto,' 'Natural Theology,' and the 'Corn Laws.'

[Bentham's Works, x. 603; Webb's Compendium of Irish Biog. (Dublin, 1878); Cat. Dub. Grad.; Quart. Rev. xxii. 102.] F. W–r.

ENT, Sir GEORGE, M.D. (1604–1689), physician, son of Josias Ent, a merchant of the Low Countries whom religious persecution had driven into England, was born at Sandwich, Kent, 6 Nov. 1604. He was sent to school at Rotterdam, where James Beckman was his master. In April 1624 he entered at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, graduated B.A. 1627, and M.A. 1631. He then studied for five years at Padua, and graduated M.D. 28 April 1636. In accordance with the custom of that university some pages of verses addressed to him by his friends were published under the title 'Laureæ Apollinari,' Padua, 1636. On the back of the title-page, with true Low Country pride, his arms are finely engraved: Sable between three hawk-bells a chevron or; the crest a falcon with bells and the motto an anagram of his name, 'Genio surget.' Among the fellow-students who wrote verses to him is John Greaves [q. v.], afterwards Savilian professor of astronomy at Oxford. Ent was incorporated M.D. at Oxford 9 Nov. 1638, and was elected a fellow of the College of Physicians 25 June 1639. He married 10 Feb. 1646 Sarah, daughter of Dr. Meverall [q. v.], treasurer of the College of Physicians. In 1642 Ent was Gulstonian lecturer in the college. He was censor for twenty-two years, registrar 1655–70, president 1670–5, and again in 1682 and 1684. In 1665, after an anatomy lecture at the college in Warwick Lane, at which the king was present, Charles II knighted Ent in the Harveian Museum. Dryden (Epistle to Dr. Charleton) has commemorated the friendship of Harvey and Ent, and Harvey left Ent five pounds to buy a ring. He was one of the original fellows of the Royal Society. His house was in the parish of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, where he died 13 Oct. 1689, and was buried in the church of St. Lawrence Jewry, close to the Guildhall of London.

His works are: 1. 'Apologia pro circuitione sanguinis,' London, 1641, of which a second edition was published in 1683. Both editions are dedicated to Sir Theophilus Clinton, earl of Lincoln, and are preceded by an address to Harvey, with laudatory Greek verses by Dr. Baldwin Hamey, and Latin verses by John Greaves. The book defends Harvey's doctrine of the circulation in general, and is a particular reply to Æmylius Parisanus, a Venetian physician. The argument is somewhat too long, but is in excellent Latin, with many happy quotations from Greek and Latin poets. The original manuscript is in the library of the College of Physicians. 2. A dedicatory letter prefixed to Harvey's 'De generatione animalium,' 1651. Harvey was inclined to postpone the publication of this book indefinitely for further observations, but Ent persuaded the great physiologist to entrust the manuscript to him, and with the author's leave published it, giving in the dedication to the president and fellows of the

College of Physicians a full account of the transaction. 3. 'ANTIΔIATPIBH sive animadversiones in Malachiæ Thrustoni M.D. Diatribam de respirationis usu primario,' London, 1679. Thurston in his introduction implies that his work was approved by Ent, which was probably the reason of this careful examination of his several propositions. The book contains a portrait of Ent as an old man in full-bottomed wig and doctor's gown. A collected edition of Ent's works was published at Leyden in 1687.

[Munk's Coll. of Phys. i. 223; Willis's William Harvey, a History of the Discovery of the Circulation of the Blood, 1878; Works; Thurston's De Respiratione, Leyden, 1671.] N. M.

ENTICK, JOHN (1703?–1773), schoolmaster and author, residing in St. Dunstan's, Stepney, was probably born about 1703. According to the 'Address,' December 1770, prefixed to his 'New Latin and English Dictionary,' 1771, he was ten years at college, and must have commenced teaching about 1720. His first publication, the 'Speculum Latinum,' was in 1728, 'to make Latin neither tedious nor obscure,' on a system tried by him with success when it was his 'lot to be perplexed with a very dull boy.' In this work he made known that he was ready to print the 'Evidences of Christianity from the great Huetius, Eusebius,' &c., if encouraged; and the announcement was followed by the book in 1729, he styling himself on its title-page student of divinity. In 1736 he issued a proposal, which fell through, to print 'Chaucer' in 2 vols. folio, with explanatory notes; and there and thenceforth he put M.A. after his name, though there is no evidence where he obtained his degree. In 1754 he published his 'Phædri Fabulæ,' with accents and notes. In 1755 he agreed with Shebbeare and Jonathan Scott to write for their anti-ministerial paper, 'The Monitor,' appearing every Saturday, at a salary of 200*l.* a year; and his attacks on the government, in Nos. 357, 358, 360, 373, 376, 378, and 380, caused his house to be entered and his papers seized under a general warrant in November 1762. He sued the authorities for illegal seizure over this, claiming 2,000*l.* damages, and obtained a verdict for 300*l.* in 1765. He published in 1757 a 'New Naval History,' with lives and portraits, dedicated to Admiral Vernon. He married a widow in 1760, losing her the same year; and in 1763 he published a 'General History of the Late War.' In 1764 he issued his 'Spelling Dictionary,' each edition of which comprised twenty thousand copies; in 1766 he brought out an edition of Maitland's 'Survey of London,' with additions; in 1771 appeared his 'New Latin and English Dictionary' and an 'English Grammar;' and he is likewise credited with a 'Ready Reckoner,' some pamphlets on freemasonry, and a share both in the new 'Week's Preparation' and the new 'Whole Duty of Man.' Altogether, as his own 'Address' (supra) puts it, he was engaged for half a century either as tutor, schoolmaster, writer, or corrector of the press, labouring incessantly, chiefly for Dilly. He died at Stepney (where he was buried) on 22 May 1773, he being about seventy years old. He left a large work, in 4 vols., 'The Present State of the British Empire,' helped by other hands, nearly ready, which was brought out in 1774. In 1776 appeared a new edition of his 'Survey and History of London,' with his portrait, from a picture by Burgess, in clerical dress, as frontispiece; and Crakelt and others have edited his dictionaries repeatedly down to 1836. In Lysons's 'Environs,' by error, his name is printed 'Entinck.'

[Howell's State Trials, xix. col. 1029 et seq.; Entick's Latin Dictionary, 1771; Gignoux's Child's Best Instructor, 5th ed.; Watt's Bibl. Brit.; Lysons's Environs of London (1795 ed.), iii. 437, 457; Bromley's Catalogue; Nichols's Illustr. Lit. v. 803; Lady's Mag. 1773.] J. H.

ENTWISLE, JOSEPH (1767–1841), methodist minister, second son of William Entwisle and his wife, Ellen Makin, who were members of a presbyterian church in Manchester, was born there on 15 April 1767, being one of five sons who grew up to manhood. He was taught at the free school connected with the old presbyterian chapel, Manchester. At the age of fourteen Entwisle joined the methodists, and made diligent use of a good library at the preacher's house in Oldham Street. When not quite sixteen he began to preach, and was known as 'the boy preacher.' Wesley called him out to the itinerant work, and in 1787 sent him to the Oxfordshire circuit. Four years after, at the Manchester conference, he was received into the full ministry while stationed in Halifax. In May 1792 he married Mary Pawson, second daughter of Marmaduke Pawson, farmer, Thorner, near Leeds, by whom he had six children. Two of his sons, Joseph and William, became ministers in the methodist connexion. During the next few years Entwisle laboured in Leeds, Wakefield, Hull, Macclesfield, Manchester, Liverpool, and London, winning a well-deserved popularity by his preaching power, personal excellence, and judicious management. While in Macclesfield his wife died. When stationed in Lon-

don he married his second wife, Lucy Hine of Kingsland Crescent, in October 1805. He was at this time appointed the first missionary secretary. The conference of 1812 was held in Leeds, and Entwisle was elected president. Henceforward he filled a foremost place in the councils of the connexion, and did much to mould its policy and guide its affairs. The busy public life he led left him little time for literary work, but in 1820 he published an 'Essay on Secret Prayer,' a volume which obtained a large circulation, and was translated into French. He also contributed biographical and practical articles to the 'Methodist Magazine.' The later years of Entwisle's ministry were spent in Bristol, Birmingham, Sheffield, and London, where he was several times reappointed. In 1825 he was elected president of the conference a second time. He ceased to itinerate in 1834, being appointed house governor of the new Theological Institution opened at Hoxton for the education and training of young ministers. Through failure of health he resigned the office four years after, and retired to Tadcaster, where his only daughter lived. He preached occasionally and with much acceptance until within a few days of his death, which occurred on Saturday, 6 Nov. 1841, at the age of seventy-four.

[Memoir by his son, 7th ed., 1861; Minutes of the Methodist Conferences.] W. B. L.

ENTY, JOHN (1675?–1743), presbyterian minister, son of John Enty, a travelling tailor in Cornwall, was born in that county about 1675. The boy was working with his father at Tregothnan, the seat of the Boscawen family, when he attracted the notice of a Mrs. Fortescue, who sent him to a grammar school and thence to the Taunton academy, under Matthew Warren. Fortified by a recommendation from Warren, he went to preach at Plymouth, some time after the death (15 May 1696) of Nicholas Sherwill, pastor of one of the two presbyterian congregations. Sherwill's place was filled for a short time by his assistant, Byfield, who, according to John Fox (1693–1763) [q. v.], 'had the best sense and parts of any dissenter that ever lived' in Plymouth. The congregation, however, set aside Byfield and chose Enty, as 'a bright and serious young man.' He was ordained at Plymouth on 11 May 1698. Fox disparages his talents, but admits his power of moving the passions and the charm of his musical voice. In 1708 his congregation, numbering five hundred persons, built for him a new place of worship in Batter Street. He married well, and thus acquired means and position.

In the assembly of united ministers, which met half-yearly at Exeter, Enty sided with the conservative party, and eventually became its leader. He was rather a martinet, and haughty to opponents, but put his friends at ease by the frankness of a simple and kindly nature. He kept an eye on the orthodoxy of candidates for the ministry, but was not a prime mover against James Peirce, the Exeter heretic. After the exclusion of Peirce (1719) Enty was chosen (1720) his successor at James's Meeting. He was succeeded at Plymouth by Peter Baron, who had assisted him from 1700, and was ordained his colleague on 19 July 1704.

At Exeter Enty became the presiding spirit of the assembly, and its authorised spokesman in the controversy which followed the exclusion of Peirce. His steady adherence to his principles established him in reputation and honour throughout the twenty-three years of his Exeter ministry. He was little of a pastor, confining himself to pulpit duty, taking no exercise, and caring for no amusements. His health remained good till, in May 1743, his constitution was broken by an epidemic. He died on 26 Nov. 1743.

Enty was twice married: first, to 'an agreeable woman' of good fortune at Kingsbridge, Devonshire, who died childless. Very soon after her death his old friend, Mrs. Vincent, whose house at Plymouth was 'the great inn for all dissenting ministers,' made up a match between him and Ann, eldest daughter of Savery of Shilston, near Modbury, Devonshire, a dissenting family of county rank.

He published: 1. 'The Ministry secured from Contempt,' &c., 1707, 4to (sermon, on Tit. ii. 15, to the Exeter assembly). 2. 'A Defence of the Proceedings of the Assembly at Exeter,' &c., 1719, 8vo (in reply to Peirce). 3. 'Truth and Liberty consistent,' &c., 1720, 8vo (a further defence, in reply to Peirce's rejoinder). 4. 'A Preservative against . . . corruptions of Reveal'd Religion,' Exon, 1730, 8vo. 5. 'A Defense of . . . a Preservative,' 1730, 8vo. Also single sermons, 1716, 4to; 1717, 8vo; 1725, 8vo; 1727, 8vo.

[Fox's Character of Enty, in Monthly Repository, 1821, p. 325 sq.; Fox's Memoirs, ib. pp. 135, 197 sq.; Murch's Hist. Presb. and Gen. Bapt. Churches in West of Engl. 1835, pp. 412, 500; Worth's Hist. Nonconf. in Plymouth, 1876, pp. 16, 36; manuscript list of ministers in the records of the Exeter Assembly.] A. G.

EOGHAN, Saint and Bishop (*d.* 618), was of Ardsratha, now Ardstraw, in the county of Tyrone and diocese of Derry. Descended from Ugaine Mor on the father's side

he was thus connected by kindred with the chieftains of Leinster, while through his mother, Muindech, he claimed relationship with the Ulster families. In his boyhood he, with many others—among whom was Tigernach, afterwards bishop at Clones—was captured by pirates and carried off to Britain. St. Ninian, of the monastery of Rosnat, better known as Candida Casa or Whithorn, interceded for them with the king, and, having obtained their liberty, took them into his establishment, and 'brought them up in ecclesiastical discipline.' Some years after Gaulish pirates, in one of their inroads, again carried them away captive, one of their number on this occasion being Corpre, afterwards bishop at Cuil-rathain, now Coleraine. They were brought to Armorica, or Britannia minor (Brittany), by their captors, and there employed in turning a mill. One day the steward, finding them engaged in study instead of work, sternly ordered them to turn the mill; but an angel is said to have come to their assistance and relieved them.

Eoghan and Tigernach subsequently returned to Ireland, where the former founded a monastery at Hy Cualann, in the north of co. Wicklow. There he remained fifteen years, ruling over many bishops and presbyters. With him was placed Coemgen (Kevin), his brother's son, afterwards so famous, and under his instruction he learned the Psalms (probably the chanting of them) and was also employed as steward. Eoghan, in obedience to a divine admonition, next visited the north of Ireland to preach the Word of God. Here he helped Tigernach, who had also proceeded to the north, to found several monasteries. Chief among these were Cluaineois, now Clones, in the barony of Dartry and co. Monaghan, and Gabail-liuin, now Galloon, co. Fermanagh. The two saints were united in a spiritual compact, and rendered each other mutual assistance. Eoghan had much influence with the fierce chieftains of Ardstraw, and when Fiachra slew one of the monks in the doorway of the oratory, in the presence and with the approval of his father, Lugaid, the son of Setna, uncle to St. Columba, Eoghan informed Lugaid that not one of his seed should reign who should not be deformed in body, and that the son who committed the crime should die in a few days. The latter prophecy having come to pass, Lugaid repented; and on promising for himself and his successors to pay a silver screapall every third year to the monastery of Ardstraw, the punishment was reduced, and it was announced that his posterity should be councillors and judges (Brehons), and that no one should hold his kingdom in security who neglected their advice. But Eoghan was not always successful. He was unable to restrain a cruel king named Amalgid, who insisted, in spite of the saint's entreaties, on consecrating (or rather, as the writer says, desecrating) his five-barbed spear in the blood of children, according to a heathen rite.

As a proof of the generosity of Eoghan, it is related that on a journey in the north of Ireland, while travelling through a great wood sixty miles in extent near the river Bann, he was appealed to by a beggar afflicted with leprosy, and, having nothing else, bestowed on him the horses that drew his chariot. St. Corpre soon after supplied him with others.

The Bollandists are of opinion that Eoghan lived in the beginning of the sixth century; but as this belief is founded on the statement that he foretold the birth of St. Columba, which took place in 520, it is of little weight. The choice seems to lie between 618, the date given by Bishop Reeves, and 570, that assigned by Ussher. But the former seems the most probable. His day is 23 Aug.

[Bollandists' Acta Sanct. 23 Aug. iv. 624–6; Martyrology of Donegal, 23 Aug.; Calendar of Œngus, p. clxvii; Lanigan's Eccl. Hist. ii. 190; Book of Hymns, Rev. J. H. Todd, fasc. i. 103.]

T. O.

EON, CHEVALIER D'. [See D'EON DE BEAUMONT.]

EPINE, FRANCESCA MARGHERITA DE L' (*d.* 1746), vocalist, a native of Tuscany, came to England with her German master, Greber, and was heard at York Buildings in 1692, becoming 'so famous for her singing' that she performed there and at Freeman's Yard during the remainder of that season. In May 1703 she received twenty guineas 'for one day's singing in ye play called ye Fickle Sheperdesse;' while her appearance at Lincoln's-Inn-Fields Theatre (where she was to sing 'four of her most celebrated Italian songs') on 1 June 1703, though announced to be her last, was followed by another on 8 June, when a song called 'The Nightingale' was added to her répertoire. Her great success induced her to remain in London, and thus she became associated with the establishment of Italian opera in England. She first appeared at Drury Lane, 29 Jan. 1704, singing some of Greber's music between the acts of the play. Thenceforth she frequently performed not only at that theatre but at the Haymarket and Lincoln's Inn-Fields. She sang before and after the opera 'Arsinoe,' in 1705; she similarly took part in Greber's 'Temple of Love,' 1706, where, according to Burney, she

was the principal singer; in 'Thamyris,' 1707, an opera partly arranged from Scarlatti and Buononcini, by Dr. Pepusch; 'Camilla,' where she played Prenesto, 1707; 'Pyrrhus and Demetrius,' as Marius, 1709; 'Almahide,' the first opera performed here wholly in Italian, 1710; 'Hydaspes,' 1710; 'Calypso and Telemachus,' 1712 (as Calypso); Handel's 'Pastor Fido' (as Antiocchus, the music demanding much executive power), and 'Rinaldo,' 1712; 'Teseo,' 1713; and the pasticcios 'Ernelinda' and 'Dorinda,' 1713. Her services were often engaged for the English operas at Lincoln's Inn-Fields, until 1718, when she married Dr. Pepusch and retired from the stage.

According to Downes, Margherita brought her husband at least 10,000 guineas. These 'costly canary birds,' as Cibber called the Italians, increased their income (8*l.* a week was a singer's salary) by performances at private houses and other special engagements. Margherita's singing must have possessed great merit and cleverness, and was said to be superior to anything heard in England at the time. She had been joined in 1703 by her sister Maria Gallia, who, however, did not become equally popular, and her only important rival was Mrs. Tofts, an established favourite at Drury Lane. On the second appearance of 'the Italian gentlewoman' upon these boards, early in 1704, a disturbance arose in the theatre. Mrs. Tofts's servant was implicated, and Mrs. Tofts felt it incumbent upon her to write to the manager to deny having had any share in the incident. The jealousy between the two singers, whether real or imagined, now became the talk of the town and the theme of the poetasters. The fashionable world was divided into Italian and English parties. Hughes wrote:—

Music hath learn'd the discords of the state,
And concerts jar with whig and tory hate.
Here Somerset and Devonshire attend
The British Tofts, and ev'ry note commend;
To native merit just, and pleas'd to see
We 'ave Roman arts, from Roman bondage free.
There fam'd L'Épine does equal skill employ
While list'ning peers crowd to th' estatic joy;
Bedford to hear her song his dice forsakes;
And Nottingham is raptured when she shakes;
Lull'd statesmen melt away their drowsy cares
Of England's safety, in Italian airs.

Rowe, and others, wrote less pleasantly of 'Greber's Peg' or 'The Tawny Tuscan,' and her conquests. Posterity has, notwithstanding, judged her character to be one of guileless good nature. The patience with which she endured the name 'Hecate,' bestowed upon her in consideration of her ugliness by her husband, has been recorded by Burney.

Dr. and Mrs. Pepusch lived for some time at Boswell Court, Carey Street, where a singing parrot adorned the window. In 1730 they moved to a house in Fetter Lane. Margherita, advancing in years, 'retained her hand on the harpsichord, and was in truth a fine performer,' so much so that amateurs would assemble to hear her play Dr. Bull's difficult lessons out of 'Queen Elizabeth's Virginal Book.' It appears from a manuscript diary of S. Cooke, a pupil of Dr. Pepusch, that Mrs. Pepusch fell ill on 19 July 1746, and that on 10 Aug. following, 'in the afternoon, he went to Vauxhall with the doctor, Madame Pepusch being dead.' She had been 'extremely sick' the day before.

A replica in oils of Sebastian Ricci's picture 'A Rehearsal at the Opera,' containing a portrait of Margherita, is in the possession of Messrs. John Broadwood & Sons, the pianoforte-makers. In this group of musicians 'Margaritta in black with a muff' (as the title runs) is short, dark-complexioned, but not ill-favoured. The original painting is at Castle Howard, the seat of the Earl of Carlisle in Yorkshire.

[London Gazette, 1692–1711; Daily Courant, 1703–1711; manuscripts and letters in possession of Julian Marshall, Esq.; Hawkins; Burney; Grove; Downes's Roscius Anglicanus; Cibber's Apology; Hughes's Poems, ed. Bell, i. 119; and other works quoted above.] L. M. M.

EPPS, GEORGE NAPOLEON (1815–1874), homœopathic practitioner, was the half-brother of Dr. John Epps [q. v.], and was born on 22 July 1815. After being for some years his brother's pupil and assistant, he became a member of the London College of Surgeons in 1845, and was in the same year appointed surgeon to the Homœopathic Hospital in Hanover Square. His mechanical aptitude led to his being very successful in treating spinal curvatures and deformities. In 1849 he published 'Spinal Curvature, its Theory and Cure.' He added a third part to Pulte's 'Homœopathic Physician,' brought out by his brother in 1852, on the 'Treatment of Accidents;' and published revised editions of W. Williamson's 'Diseases of Infants and Children,' and 'Diseases of Women and their Homœopathic Treatment,' in 1857. In 1859 he published a work, 'On Deformities of the Spine and on Club Foot.' He had a large practice to which he was much devoted, never sleeping out of his house for twenty years. In 1833 he married Miss Charlotte Bacon. He died on 28 May 1874.

[Homœopathic World, 1874, ix. 229; British Journal of Homœopathy, 1874, xxxii. 574.] G. T. B.

EPPS, JOHN (1805–1869), homœopathic physician, eldest son of John Epps, of a family long settled near Ashford in Kent, was born at Blackheath on 15 Feb. 1805, and educated at Mill Hill school. He was early apprenticed to a medical practitioner in London, named Durie. At the age of sixteen or seventeen he was introduced to phrenology by Mr. Sleigh, a lecturer on anatomy, and this study became a favourite one throughout his life. In 1823 he went to Edinburgh to study medicine, earning his own living by teaching classics and chemistry, his father having suffered a reverse of fortune. He became a member of the Phrenological Society, which introduced him to George Combe and other men of note. While yet a student he published 'Evidences of Christianity deduced from Phrenology,' of which a second edition was published in 1836. In 1826 he graduated M.D. In 1827 he commenced practice in the Edgware Road, London, and also began to lecture on phrenology. He had an introduction to Spurzheim from James Simpson, the phrenologist (see *Homœopathic World*, 1875, p. 290), and joined the Phrenological Society. He gave medical lectures in the Aldersgate Street lecture-room, and soon gained pupils. He also lectured frequently both in London and the country for literary institutions. In 1830 he lectured on chemistry and materia medica, in conjunction with Ryan, Sleigh, and Costello, at the school of medicine, Brewer Street, Windmill Street. On the school being broken up Epps and Ryan joined Dermott in giving lectures at the Western Dispensary, Gerrard Street, Soho. Epps also lectured on botany at the Westminster School of Medicine, Princes Street, Storey's Gate. About 1830 Epps became medical director of the Royal Jennerian and London Vaccine Institution, on the death of Dr. John Walker, the coadjutor of Jenner. Epps wrote Walker's life for the benefit of the widow, but did not realise any profit; however, he paid a small yearly sum to Mrs. Walker during her life.

In 1838 Epps directed his mind seriously to the study of homœopathy, having long felt that medicine was in a very unscientific position. He became convinced that Hahnemann's system was scientific, and applied himself with characteristic ardour to propagate it. He began by publishing a tract entitled 'What is Homœopathy?' in 1838. A majority of his patients adopted his new views, which he further explained in 'Domestic Homœopathy,' 1840, and 'Homœopathy and its Principles Explained,' 1841. He also began to lecture actively on the new system. He continued throughout life an ardent advocate of homœopathy, and gained a large practice, although from 1844 he became increasingly deaf. In 1851 he was elected lecturer on materia medica at the Homœopathic Hospital.

Besides medical practice, Epps was interested in a multitude of public questions, and incessantly lectured, wrote letters, spoke at public meetings, and worked privately in connection with parliamentary, religious, and social reforms. Among his attached friends were Mazzini, Wilson, of the 'Economist,' Kossuth, Edward Miall, and James Stansfeld. In 1847 he unsuccessfully contested Northampton as a radical. In 1835 he began to publish the 'Christian Physician and Anthropological Magazine,' which he largely wrote himself. It was not pecuniarily successful. The last number (1 Feb. 1839) bore the title, 'The Phrenological (anthropological) Magazine and Christian Physician.' From 1841 he was connected with the Working Men's Church at Dockhead, Bermondsey, and lectured there every Sunday evening to large audiences on religious and social subjects, which he treated for the most part in a very liberal spirit. One series of twelve lectures, disproving the existence of the Devil, was published anonymously in 1842, under the title, 'The Devil,' and roused much opposition. His incessant activity, both publicly and privately, no doubt shortened his life. For some years he suffered from heart-disease, which caused his death in Great Russell Street, London, on 12 Feb. 1869.

Epps was of short stature and sturdy frame, and had a beaming, self-confident expression. He was regarded by many of the working classes as a prophet in medicine, and, although neither profound nor original, he impressed many people with the idea that he was both, owing to his great earnestness and confidence in his own views, and his evident desire to benefit his fellow-creatures. He had a great command of words, a fine sonorous voice, and an animated manner. His philanthropic efforts and personal acts of kindness were numberless.

In 1831 Epps married Miss Ellen Elliott, who survived him, and edited his 'Diary,' a diffuse and scrappy book, containing a large proportion of religious reflections, and failing to give a connected narrative of his life. Mrs. Epps, as 'E. Elliott,' published three novels, one of which, 'The Living among the Dead,' 1860, achieved a certain success. She was born in 1809 and died in 1876.

Epps's principal works, besides those mentioned above, were: 1. 'Horæ Phrenologicæ,' 1834. 2. 'Domestic Homœopathy,' 1842. 3. 'Treatise on the Virtues of Arnica,' &c.,

1850. 4. Editions of Pulte's 'Homœopathic Domestic Physician,' with explanatory notes, 1852, 1854, 1855. 5. 'Constipation, its Theory and Cure,' 1854. 6. 'Consumption, its Nature and Treatment,' 1859. He was joint editor of the 'London Medical and Surgical Journal' in 1828–9; and at a later period brought out a 'Journal of Health and Disease,' 1845–52, and 'Notes of a New Truth,' 1856–69.

[Diary of John Epps, edited by his widow, 1875; review of same, British Journal of Homœopathy, xxxiii. 290–7; obituary notices, same journal, xxvii. 350, 351; Homœopathic World, iv. 66–8; J. F. Clarke's Autobiographical Recollections of the Medical Profession, pp. 137–40.]

G. T. B.

ERARD, Saint and Bishop (*fl.* 730–754), was one of those Irishmen who, having left their native country to labour on the continent, were lost sight of at home, and are not mentioned in the native annals. According to his life by Conrad A Monte Puellarum (A.D. 1340), derived from a more ancient life in the church of Ratisbon, his brother, Hildulph, had gone forth as a missionary to the lower parts of Germany, and in course of time was chosen to the episcopal chair of Treves by the princes and people. Erard went to visit him, but, not finding him there, after some search discovered him living as a hermit in the Vosges 'for the love of Christ.' Staying with him for a time, he then remonstrated with him on his mode of life, and pointed out that it was his duty to take heed to the Lord's flock, and that there was more merit in preaching and teaching than in leading the life of a hermit. Influenced by this he gathered disciples round him, and Erard remained with him fourteen years in that region. Afterwards, having arranged for the oversight of his flock by placing in charge Adalbert, called, like Hildulph, his brother, but probably in both cases in a religious sense, he bade farewell to him, and going into Bavaria to preach arrived at Ratisbon. Thence he was divinely admonished to proceed to the Rhine and labour in Alsace. It was during this missionary journey that he baptised Ottilia, daughter of the Duke of the Allemanni, from whom Odilieburgh, near Liège, derived its name. The infant is said to have been born blind, and to have recovered her sight through St. Erard's prayers. Having accomplished his mission there, he returned to Bavaria and settled at Ratisbon. Here he passed the remainder of his life, and so much did he love the place that, 'with his own hands, he dug a well of sweet water hard by the monastery.' He was buried in the church attached to it. According to Ware some have made him bishop of Freisingen, others of Treves, and others again of Ratisbon; but the German writers deny that he held the bishopric of any of those towns. It has also been stated that he was bishop of Ardagh, or more correctly at Ardagh, before leaving Ireland, but the total silence of the native annals on the subject, and the absence of any mention of his name in them, render this extremely doubtful. It is possible he may have been a monastic bishop at Ratisbon according to primitive usage, and having no territorial jurisdiction is not mentioned in the lists.

It is needless to say that the foreign scribes have made sad confusion in the names, and doubts have therefore been expressed as to his native country. The second 'Life' in the 'Acta Sanctorum' terms him a 'Goth' (Gothus), an evident mistake for Scothus, the form in which the name of Scot is sometimes given. Again he is said to be of the Niverni, which is without doubt a corruption of Iverni, a form of Hiberni. Owing to these and other errors the numerous so-called lives of the saint which exist rather tend to confuse the facts of his history, and to obscure his nationality, some deriving his name from the German, others from the Hebrew; Erard, however, is a well-known Irish name.

The best account appears to be that of Conrad above referred to, from which the foregoing facts are taken. We are indebted for it to the learned Stephen White, who found it in the monastery at Ratisbon, of which he was canon, and communicated it to Archbishop Ussher.

The day of his death is 8 Jan., at which he is entered in the Irish calendars, but Alban Butler places him at 9 Feb., the day on which he is found in the Scottish lists.

The period of his death is so uncertain that Dr. Lanigan says he 'dares not decide it.' Various dates have been suggested from 675, which Dempster advocates, to 754, which is that of Ware, Colgan, and Baronius, and seems the most probable. He was canonised by Pope Leo IX in 1052.

[Bollandists' Act. Sanct., 8 Jan. tom i. 533–546; Ware's Bishops, Ardagh, i. 248; Lanigan's Eccl. Hist. iii. 105; Todd's Liber Hymnorum Fascic. i. 103; Ussher's Works, vi. 299.] T. O.

ERBURY, WILLIAM (1604–1654), independent divine, was born at or near Roath Dagfield, Glamorganshire, in 1604, and after receiving some education at a local school matriculated at Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1619, taking the degree of B.A. in October 1623, when he returned to Wales, and taking orders was presented to the living of St. Mary's, Cardiff. Wood states (*Athenæ Oxon.* ed. 1815, ii. 100–1) that he was always

schismatically affected, preached in conventicles, and refused to read the declaration regarding sabbath sports, for which he was several times cited before the court of high commission at Lambeth, and was punished for his obstinacy. At his visitation in 1634 the Bishop of Llandaff (Laud) pronounced Erbury a schismatical and dangerous preacher, and, after a judicial admonition, warned him that he should proceed further if he did not submit. On Erbury declining to submit the bishop preferred articles against him in the court of high commission. The case made slow progress, as Laud complains in 1636 (Wharton, *Troubles of Laud*, i. 538), and encouraged Erbury to persist in his contumacy and his followers to consider him faultless. The prosecution culminated in 1638, when Erbury was forced to resign his living and leave the diocese. In 1640 he commenced to preach against episcopacy and ecclesiastical ceremonies, and having declared for independency and the parliament, Christopher Love (Love, *Vindication*, ed. 1651) obtained for him the chaplaincy of Major Skippon's regiment, with the pay of eight shillings per day. While in the army he is said to have occasionally taken part in military affairs, and to have corrupted the soldiers with strange opinions and antinomian doctrines. Edwards (*Gangræna*, p. 78, ed. 1646) says he became a seeker and taught universal redemption, and in 1645 went to London to propagate his views. In July the same year, in a sermon at Bury St. Edmunds, he affirmed that Adam's sin could only be imputed to Adam, and denied the divinity of Christ. He now went to reside in the Isle of Ely, travelling through the surrounding district and preaching in private houses. He did not, however, sever his connection with the army, for in 1646, after the surrender of Oxford, he was a regimental chaplain and preacher to a congregation which met in a house opposite Merton College Chapel. He opposed in every way the parliamentary visitors, with whom in several public disputations he appears to have had the better of the argument: an account of one is given in 'A Relation of a Disputation in St. Mary's Church in Oxon between Mr. Cheynel and Mr. Erbury,' 1646. Although very popular with the soldiers, he was about this time, on account of his Socinian opinions, directed to leave Oxford, when he went to London, and for some time preached at Christ Church, Newgate Street, until his tenets caused him to be summoned before the committee for plundered ministers at Westminster in 1652, when he made an orthodox profession of faith. The committee refused to accept this as genuine, and are believed to have committed him to prison. In the following year he and John Webster had a disputation with two ministers in a church in Lombard Street, when Erbury declared that the wisest ministers and the purest churches were then 'befooled and confounded by reason of learning,' that 'Babylon is the church in her ministers and the Great Whore the church in her worshippers,' and made a number of other equally absurd statements, which caused the meeting to end in a riot. After his deprivation of his chaplaincy in 1645 he is supposed to have lived on the contributions of his admirers; his own property he alleges to have been plundered in Wales in 1642. He died at the beginning of 1654, and was buried either in Christ Church, Newgate Street, or in the burial-ground adjoining the old Bethlehem Hospital. His widow, Dorcas, became a quakeress, and in 1656 was apprehended for paying divine honours at Bristol to James Nayler, when she alleged that Nayler was the son of God and had raised her to life after she had been dead two days. She was liberated after a few days' confinement; when she died is uncertain. Erbury, although according to his lights both pious and conscientious, was a mystic and a fanatic with some little learning, good parts, and a violent temper. His leading tenets were that about the end of the apostolic times the Holy Spirit withdrew itself and men substituted an external and carnal worship in its stead; that when apostasy was removed the new Jerusalem would descend so that certain men could already see it; that baptism consisted in going ankle deep only into the water, and that none had a right to administer that ordinance without a fresh commission from heaven. Baxter considered him one of the chiefs of the anabaptists, but Neal describes him as a turbulent antinomian. His chief writings are: 1. 'The Great Mysterie of Godliness: Jesus Christ our Lord God and Man, and Man with God, one in Jesus Christ our Lord,' 1640. 2. 'Ministers for Tythes. proving they are no Ministers of the Gospel,' 1653. 3. Sermons on several occasions, one of which is entitled 'The Lord of Hosts,' 1653. 4. 'An Olive Leaf, or some Peaceable Considerations to the Christian Meeting at Christ's Church in London,' 1654. 5. 'The Reign of Christ and the Saints with Him on Earth a Thousand Years, one Day, and the Day at Hand,' 1654. 6. 'Jack Pudding, or a Minister made a Black Pudding. Presented to Mr. R. Farmer, parson of Nicholas Church at Bristol,' 1654. 7. 'The Testimony of William Erbury left upon Record for the Saints of Succeeding Ages,' 1658.

[Brook's Lives of the Puritans, iii. 185; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. ii. 100–1, &c. (ed. 1815); Wharton's

Troubles, &c., of Laud, i. 533, 555; Edwards's Gangræna, pts. i. and ii. (2nd edit.); Walker's Attempt, &c., pt. i. 125–6; Erbury's Testimony; Neal's Hist. Puritans, iii. 397 (2nd edit.); Biog. Brit. v. 3199 (ed. 1747); Antitrinitarian Biog. i. 87, iii. 167–8; Love's Vindication, p. 36 (ed. 1651). A. C. B.

ERCELDOUNE, THOMAS OF, called also the RHYMER and LEARMONT (*fl.* 1220?–1297?), seer and poet, occupies much the same position in Scottish popular lore as Merlin does in that of England, but with some historical foundation. His actual existence and approximate date can be fixed by contemporary documents. The name of 'Thomas Rimor de Ercildun,' with four others, is appended as witness to a deed whereby Petrus de Haga de Bemersyde agreed to pay half a stone of wax annually to the abbot and convent of Melrose for the chapel of St. Cuthbert at Old Melrose (*Liber de Melros*, Bannatyne Club, i. 298). The document is undated, but the Petrus de Haga cannot be he who witnessed the signature of Richard de Moreville, constable of Scotland, about 1170 (*Liber S. Marie de Dryburgh*, Bannatyne Club, 1847, p. 269), and must be identified with the person of that name who lived about 1220 (*ib.* pp. 94–6), as two of the four witnesses mentioned above were Oliver, abbot of Dryburgh (*c.* 1250–68), and Hugh de Peresby, viscount of Roxburgh, alive in 1281. In the chartulary of the Trinity House of Soltra, preserved in the Advocates' Library, Edinburgh, is a deed conveying to that house all the lands held by inheritance in Erceldoune by 'Thomas de Ercildoun filius et heres Thome Rymour de Ercildoun.' The date has been usually quoted 1299, but Dr. Murray gives it accurately for the first time as 2 Nov. 1294 (*Thomas of Erceldoune*, 1875, Introd. x–xi). 'The superiority of the property called Rhymer's Lands, now owned by Mr. Charles Wilson, Earlstoun, still belongs to the Trinity College Church in Edinburgh,' says Mr. James Tait ('Earlstoun,' in *Proc. of Berwickshire Naturalists' Club*, 1866, v. 263). The area of the lands has been the same, nine acres and a half, for the last three hundred years. They seem to have been held by Thomas and his son, not from the crown but from the Earls of Dunbar. An ancient watermill, known as 'Rhymer's Mill,' was situated on the property.

Robert Manning of Brunne (in *English Chronicle*, written *c.* 1338, ll. 93–4) says:—

> I see in song, in sedgeyng tale
> Of Erceldun and of Kendale.

Sir Thomas Grey (*c.* 1355, in *Scalacronica*), Barbour (*c.* 1375, in *The Bruce*, bk. ii. v. 86), Androw of Wyntoun (*c.* 1424, in *Oryginale*, bk. viii. c. 31), Walter Bower (*d.* 1449), and Mair also speak of Thomas of Erceldoune. Harry the Blind Minstrel calls him 'Thomas Rimour.' Hector Boece is the first who uses the title 'Thomas Leirmont' (*Scotorum Historia*, Paris, 1575, lib. xiii. 291). Alexander Nisbet, following Boece, extends the title to Thomas Learmont of Earlstoun in the Merss. 'Rymour was a Berwickshire name in those days, one John Rymour, a freeholder, having done homage to Edward I in 1296' (TAIT, ut supra, p. 264). Robert Learmont, the last of a family of that patronymic claiming descent from Thomas of Erceldoune, died unmarried about 1840. The Russian poet Michael Lermontoff (1814–41) believed he had an ancestor in the Rhymer.

Erceldoune or Erceldoun, also written Ercheldun, Ersylton, and Ersseldoune, is the modern Earlstoun or Earlston, a village in Berwickshire about thirty miles from Berwick, situated on the Leader, a northern tributary of the Tweed. The name of Erceldoune was not altered into Earlstoun but supplanted by it. It was a place of considerable importance in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and is connected with the Lindesey family and the Earls of March. Cospatrick, earl of March, took the surname of Erceldoune, and the castle at the east end of the village, said to have been owned by that family, was probably the place where David I signed the foundation charter of Melrose Abbey 'apud Ercheldon' in June 1136. Part of 'Rhymour's Tour,' which tradition assigns to Thomas, still exists at the west end of the village. A stone in the church wall in Earlstoun bears the inscription

> Auld Rhymer's race
> Lies in this place.

Tradition says that this stone, which was defaced in 1782, was transferred from the old church.

The reputation of Thomas as a prophet is connected with the date of 1285 and the death of Alexander III predicted in that year to Patrick, eighth earl of Dunbar. It is Walter Bower (*d.* 1449), the continuator of Fordun's 'Scotichronicon,' who first mentions that Thomas, when visiting the castle of Dunbar, and asked by the Earl of March what another day was to bring forth, replied: 'Heu diei crastinæ! diei calamitatis et miseriæ! qua ante horam explicite duodecimam audietur tam vehemens ventus in Scotia, quod a magnis retroactis temporibus consimilis minime inveniebatur' (lib. x. c. 43). The intelligence of the king's death was duly received before noon the next day. The story is repeated by Mair and Hector Boece. Sir Walter Scott prosaically reduces it to a false

weather forecast: 'Thomas presaged to the Earl of March that the next day would be windy; the weather proved calm; but news arrived of the death of Alexander III, which gave an allegorical turn to the prediction, and saved the credit of the prophet. It is worthy of notice that some of the rhymes vulgarly ascribed to Thomas of Erceldoune are founded apparently on meteorological observation. And doubtless before the invention of barometers a weather-wise prophet might be an important personage' ('Sir Tristrem,' in *Works*, v. 12). The incident occurred in 1285, and Harry the Minstrel associates Thomas with a critical passage in the life of Wallace in 1296 or 1297, when seized by English soldiers and left for dead at Ayr.

Thomas Rimour in to the faile was than.

As the son of Thomas had already in 1294 devised the paternal estate, it seems natural to suppose that Thomas was dead three years later, but Dr. Murray inclines to the theory that he was still alive in retirement at the Faile or Feale, a Cluniac priory near Ayr (*Introduction*, p. xvi).

The reputed sayings of Thomas were proverbial soon after his death. Barbour (*c.* 1375) refers to a prophecy concerning Robert I. After Bruce had slain the Red Cumyn at Dumfries in 1306 the Bishop of St. Andrews is introduced (*Bruce*, bk. ii. v. 85–7) as saying:

sekerly
I hop Thomas prophecy
Off hersildoune sall weryfyd be.

Androw of Wyntoun affirms that 'qwhylum spak Thomas' of the battle of Kilblane fought by Sir Andrew Moray against the Baliol faction in 1335 (*Orygynale*, bk. viii. c. 31). Sir Thomas Grey, constable of Norham, in his Norman-French 'Scalacronica,' written during his captivity at Edinburgh Castle in 1355, alludes to the predictions of Merlin, which, like those of 'William Banastre ou de Thomas de Erceldoun . . . furount ditz en figure.' But there is yet earlier evidence of the popular belief in his prophetic gifts. Among the Harleian MSS. (No. 2253, l. 127) in the British Museum we find a prediction written before 1320, with the superscription, 'La countesse de Donbar demanda a Thomas de Essedoune quant la guere descoce prendreit fyn.' The answers to this question are given in seventeen brief paragraphs in a southern (or south midland) dialect, and probably by an English author. They describe the various improbabilities which are to take place before the war shall come to an end within twenty-one years. From one vatication, 'when bambourne [Bannockburn] is donged Wyth dedemen,' it is highly probable that the piece was composed on the eve of the battle of Bannockburn in 1314, and the forgery circulated under the name of the national seer in order to damp the courage of the Scots and to give good omen to the English. Twenty-one years back was 1293, when Thomas may have been alive. The lines were first printed by Pinkerton (*Ancient Scottish Poems*, 1786, i. lxxviii), who is followed by W. Scott (*Border Minstrelsy*, iv. 130) in assuming the Countess of Dunbar to be the famous Black Agnes, the defender of Dunbar Castle in 1337; but this is not possible from the age of the Harleian MS., and the countess is no doubt meant as the wife of the earl to whom Thomas predicted the death of Alexander III (Murray, *Introduction*, p. xix).

The earliest composition attributed to him in his double character of seer and poet, the romance of Thomas and the 'ladye gaye,' which is, of course, a work long posterior to his date, may be placed shortly after 1400. He is represented as meeting the lady on Huntly Banks by Eildon Tree, as making love to her, and being carried to her country, which is not in heaven, paradise, hell, purgatory, or 'on middel-erthe,' but 'another cuntre.' There he lives for three years or more. The time comes when the customary tribute to hell has to be paid, and, so that he should not be chosen by the fiend, the elf-queen conducts him back to earth. She gives him the power of prophecy as a token, and in compliance with repeated wishes furnishes him with a specimen of her own art in a prospective view of the wars between England and Scotland from the time of Bruce to the death of Robert III in 1406. The poem is in three fyttes, and has come down to us in four complete copies. The earliest is the Thornton MS. at Cambridge, written 1430–40. All the copies are in English, and speak of an older story, Scottish, possibly the actual work of Thomas. The opinion of Professor Child is that the original story 'was undoubtedly a romance which narrated the adventure of Thomas with the elf-queen simply, without specification of his prophecies. In all probability it concluded, in accordance with the ordinary popular tradition, with Thomas's return to fairyland after a certain time passed in this world. For the history of Thomas and the elf-queen is but another version of what is related of Ogier le Danois and Morgan the Fay' (*Popular Ballads*, pt. ii. 1884, 319). Dr. Murray considers that as a whole the prophecies flow naturally from the tale, and have not been tacked on by a subsequent writer. 'The poem in its present form bears evidence of being later than 1401, the date of

the invasion of Scotland by Henry IV, or at least 1388, the date of the battle of Otterbourne' (*Introd.* pp. xxvi, xxiv). Brandl is of opinion that the writer was an Englishman. The whole of the events under fytte ii. can be identified, and, with one exception, are arranged in chronological order. Most of the predictions in the third fytte appear to be old legends adapted to later requirements. The first fytte was printed by Scott as an appendix to the modern traditionary ballad in the 'Border Minstrelsy,' and the whole by Jamieson (*Popular Ballads and Songs*, Edinburgh, 1806), by Dr. Laing (*Select Remains*, 1822, new ed. 1885), and by Halliwell-Phillipps (*Illustr. of Fairy Mythology*, 1845). The most complete edition is that of Dr. J. A. H. Murray, 'The Romance and Prophecies printed from Five MSS., with illustrations from the Prophetic Literature of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries' (E. E. T. S., 1875), with valuable introduction and notes. A. Brandl also edited the romance in 1880 at Berlin. Professor Child gives several texts of the first fytte with an introduction (*Popular Ballads*, pt. ii. 1884, 317–29).

'During the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries,' says Chambers, 'to fabricate a prophecy in the name of Thomas the Rhymer appears to have been found a good stroke of policy on many occasions' (*Popular Rhymes of Scotland*, 1870, p. 212). Collections were made of these forebodings by various persons, generally in alliterative verse. The earliest printed edition is 'The whole Prophesie of Scotland, England, and some part of France and Denmark, prophesied bee mervellous Merling, Beid, Bertlington, Thomas Rymour, Waldhaue, Eltraine, Banester, and Sibbilla, all according in one,' R. Waldegrave, 1603, sm. 8vo. This was collated with an edition of 1615 and reproduced by the Bannatyne Club (1833). Numerous reprints in chapbook form have appeared down to quite recent times. Certain predictions of Thomas were printed by the Rev. J. R. Lumby from a manuscript of the early part of the fifteenth century (*Bernardus de Cura Rei Fam., with some Early Scottish Prophecies*, E. E. T. S., 1870). At the time of the accession of James VI to the English throne the reputation of Thomas as a successful prophet was renewed. The Earl of Stirling and Drummond of Hawthornden, in dedicating to the king their respective works, 'Monarchicke Tragedies' and 'Forth Feasting,' refer to the 'propheticke rimes' of Thomas foreshadowing the event. Archbishop Spottiswoode speaks of Thomas 'having foretold, so many ages before, the union of the kingdoms of England and Scotland in the ninth degree of the Bruce's blood' (*History of the Church of Scotland*, Spottiswoode Soc. 1851, i. 93). The sayings were consulted even so late as during the Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745. The name of Thomas of Erceldoune was reverenced in England as well as in Scotland. He is always coupled in popular lore with Merlin and other English soothsayers, and it is remarkable that all the texts of his romances and predictions are preserved in English transcripts. More or less plausible explanations of his sayings are still applied to modern events.

To Thomas of Erceldoune is attributed a poem on the Tristrem story, belonging to the Arthurian cycle of romance, which has reached us in a single copy, the Auchinleck MS. in the Advocates' Library, transcribed by a southern hand about 1450 from a northern text written probably between 1260 and 1300. It commences with a reference to Thomas, and there are other allusions (ll. 397, 408, 2787). Robert Manning of Brunne connects the romance with the name of Thomas. Scott and Irving considered the poem the undoubted work of Thomas, but Warton, Wright, Halliwell, G. Paris, Murray, and Kölbing agree in thinking that when the unknown translator from the French original found a Thomas mentioned he himself inserted the designation of Erceldoune. The latest editor, Mr. McNeill, contends that 'the reasonable probability is that Robert Mannyng of Brunne was right when he ascribed the poem to Thomas of Erceldoune' (*Sir Tristrem*, p. xliv). It was printed for the first time by Sir W. Scott, 'Sir Tristrem, a metrical romance of the 13th century, by Thomas of Erceldoune, called the Rhymer,' London, 1804, large 8vo. A second edition appeared in 1806, a third in 1811, again in 1819, and in the collective editions of the poetical works of Scott. The first issue of Scott's text swarms with errors; some are corrected in the later editions, which are still very inaccurate according to Kölbing. Scott's 1806 text with a German glossary is reprinted in 'Gottfried's von Strassburg Werke, herausg. durch H. von der Hagen,' Breslau, 1823. A considerable portion of the text from Scott's 'Poetical Works,' v. 1833, is reproduced with introduction and notes by E. Mätzner (*Altenglische Sprachproben*, i. 231–242). The first critical text is that of E. Kölbing (*Die nordische und die englische Version der Tristansage*, Heilbronn, 1882, vol. ii.), with an elaborate introduction and complete glossary. The text has been again thoroughly edited by Mr. G. P. McNeill (Scottish Text Soc. 1886), with introduction, notes, and glossary. The numerous local tra-

ditions about 'True Thomas' are recorded by Scott (*Minstrelsy*, vol. iv.), in the 'Proceedings of the Berwickshire Naturalists' Club,' by R. Chambers (*Popular Rhymes*, 1870), and Murray (*Introduction*). Huntly Bank and the adjoining ravine, the Rhymer's Glen, were ultimately included in the domain of Abbotsford.

[The best account is given by Dr. J. A. H. Murray in his edition of The Romance and Prophecies (E. E. T. S., 1875), which may be supplemented by Thomas of Erceldoune, herausg. von A. Brandl, Berlin, 1880. Kölbing (1882) and Mr. G. P. McNeill (Scottish Text Soc. 1886) may be consulted in their editions of Sir Tristrem. See also Lord Hailes's Remarks on the Hist. of Scotland, 1773; Pinkerton's Ancient Scottish Poems, 1786; Jameson's Popular Ballads and Songs, 1806; Scott's Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border, Poetical Works, i–iv., 1833, &c., and Sir Tristrem, ib. v.; Henderson's Popular Rhythmes of Berwickshire, in Hist. of Berw. Nat Club, 1837; Madden's Notes on Sir Gawayne, 1839, p. 304; Warton's Hist. of English Poetry, 1840; Halliwell's Fairy Mythology of a Midsummer Night's Dream (Shakespeare Soc.), 1845; Life by D. Laing in Encyclopædia Britannica, 8th ed. xxi. 228; Irving's Hist. of Scottish Poetry, 1861; R. Chambers's Popular Rhymes of Scotland, 1870; Notes and Queries, 4th ser. 1873, xi. 70, 5th ser. 1874, i. 5; Wilson's Poets and Poetry of Scotland, 1876; J. Veitch's Hist. and Poetry of Scottish Border, 1878; Guest's English Rhythms, by Skeat, 1882; Ward's Catalogue of Romances in British Museum, 1883, i. 328–38; Child's English and Scottish Popular Ballads, 1884, ii. 317, &c.] H. R. T.

ERDESWICKE, SAMPSON (*d.* 1603), historian of Staffordshire, was descended from a family which could trace its ancestry from Richard de Vernon, baron of Shipbrook, 20 William I (1085-6). Originally seated at Erdeswicke Hall in Minshull Vernon, Cheshire, the Erdeswickes, after the alienation of that estate, resided for several generations in the adjacent township of Leighton, and finally settled at Sandon, Staffordshire, on the marriage of Thomas Erdeswicke with Margaret, only daughter and heiress of Sir James Stafford of that place, in the twelfth year of Edward III (1338–9). The Staffords came from Thomas Stafford and his wife Auda, coheiress of Warin Vernon, and thus a new connection was formed with the original house of Shipbrook (cf. descent given by Erdeswicke himself in *Harl. MS.* 381, f. 153 *b*). Sampson was born at Sandon. His father, Hugh Erdeswicke, rigidly adhered to the catholic faith of his ancestors, on which account he was subjected to much persecution during the reign of Elizabeth. In May 1582 Overton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, reported to the privy council that Hugh Erdeswicke, lord of the manor of Sandon, 'the sorest and dangerousest papist, one of them in all England,' was not afraid before him and Sir Walter Aston, 'openly in the sight of the whole country,' to strike a justice of the peace 'upon the pate with his crabtree staff,' and that in Sandon churchyard, for which he was bound in 200*l.* to make his appearance at the next general assizes (Strype, *Annals*, 8vo, vol. iii. pt. ii. pp. 214–215). Allusion is also made to him in 'An Ancient Editor's Note-book' (Morris, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, 3rd ser. pp. 17–18), from which it appears that he was fined and imprisoned for striking a pursuivant whom he found ransacking his house. The occurrence may well have been the preliminary to that recorded by Strype. Sampson studied at Brasenose College, Oxford, in 1553 and 1554 as a gentleman commoner, and afterwards returned to Sandon to pass his days in the pursuits of a country gentleman. His leisure was devoted to antiquarian researches, and he made numerous collections. He began his 'View' or 'Survey' of Staffordshire about 1593, and continued to labour at it until his death (Fuller, *Worthies*, 'Staffordshire,' p. 45). It commences after the style of a letter, and is addressed presumably to Camden. The history of the manuscript is enshrouded in mystery, which is not lessened by the supposition that Erdeswicke left a second and revised draft. William Burton, the historian of Leicestershire [q. v.], writing in 1604, the year after Erdeswicke's death, states that even then it was not known into whose hands the manuscript had fallen, though he had been informed that it was in the possession of Sir Thomas Gerrard of Etwall, Derbyshire (*Gent. Mag.* vol. lxviii. pt. ii. p. 1011). According to Sir William Dugdale, the original, from which he made a transcript now preserved at Merevale Hall, Warwickshire, belonged to George Digby of Sandon, and was lent by the latter to Sir Simon Degge [q. v.], who returned it with a letter dated 20 Feb. 1669, giving a gossiping account of the state of the county (Erdeswicke, *Survey*, ed. Harwood, 1844, preface, pp. liv–lix). Wood asserts that 'the original, or at least a copy,' had been acquired by Walter Chetwynd of Ingestrie [q. v.] (*Athenæ Oxon.* ed. Bliss, i. 736); but in his examination of the Ingestrie manuscripts Stebbing Shaw could not find any trace of the original (*Gent. Mag.* vol. lxviii. pt. ii. p. 921). The transcript at Ingestrie is fully described in Salt's 'List,' p. 8. Numerous other manuscript copies are extant, varying, however, not only in the orthography and language, but even in the

topographical arrangement. That in the British Museum (Harl. MS. 1990) belonged to the second Randle Holme; another in the library at Wrottesley, Staffordshire, seems to have been Camden's (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 2nd Rep. app. p. 49). In 1844 William Salt, F.S.A., printed twenty copies of 'A List and Description of the Manuscript Copies of Erdeswick's Survey of Staffordshire, which have been traced in Public Libraries or Private Collections, 1842–3;' it had previously appeared in Harwood's 1844 edition of the 'Survey,' pp. lxxix–ci. Erdeswicke had intended to include Cheshire in the 'Survey.' His collections for that county are Harl. MS. 506, 'Mr. Erdeswicke's Booke of Cheshire,' with additions by Laurence Bostock and Ralph Starkey; Harl. MS. 338, genealogical notes and extracts from charters, and Harl. MS. 1990, which contains three leaves of description. An excellent abstract of the deeds of the barons of Kinderton by him is preserved in the College of Arms. Another copy, marked as liber H. in Sir Peter Leycester's collection, is yet in the library at Tabley (Ormerod, *Cheshire*, i. xvii). 'Excerpta ex stemmate baronis de Kinderton,' by his kinsman, Sampson Erdeswicke of London, is in the British Museum, Addit. MS. 6031, f. 165. Other miscellaneous collections among the Harl. MSS. are in those numbered 818, extracts from his Staffordshire collections 5019, notes taken out of the registers of various places 1985, ex chartis S. Erdeswicke; while pedigrees of his family are to be found in Nos. 381, 1052, and 4031. Addit. MS. 6668, f. 317, has also a pedigree with deeds. Addit. MS. 5410 is a large vellum roll nearly 12 feet in length by 2 feet 2 inches in breadth, entitled 'Stemmata et propagines antiquæ familiæ de Erdeswick de Sandon,' and written and emblazoned by Robert Glover, Somerset herald, for Erdeswicke in 1586. It was presented to the Museum by Thomas Blore [q. v.] in 1791. There is also in the Harleian collection (No. 473) a thin octavo book which once belonged to Sir Simonds D'Ewes, and described by him as 'Certaine verie rare Observations of Chester, and some parts of Wales; with divers Epitaphes, Coats Armours, & other Monuments. . . . All taken by the Author, who seems to me to have been Sampson Erdeswicke, A.D. 1574.' The writer gives an account of an antiquarian ramble taken with Edward Threlkeld, LL.D., chancellor of Hereford and rector of Great Salkeld in Cumberland, whom he styles 'one of my old acquayntance syns K. Edward his tyme.' The handwriting is certainly not his, and Erdeswicke, a strict catholic, would not have been in familiar intercourse with a protestant clergyman. Threlkeld makes no mention of Erdeswicke in his will (registered in P. C. C., 9, Leicester). The portion relating to Cumberland, Northumberland, &c., was printed in 1848 by M. A. Richardson of Newcastle, in his series of reprints of rare tracts.

Erdeswicke died in 1603, on 11 April, say Fuller and Wood, but his will is dated 15 May of that year. He was buried in Sandon Church, 'which church was a little before new glazed and repaired by him' (Fuller, loc. cit.) He was twice married, first to Elizabeth, second daughter and coheiress of Humphrey Dixwell of Church-Waver, Warwickshire, and secondly, 24 April 1593, to Mary, widow of Everard Digby of Tugby, Leicestershire, and second daughter of Francis Neale of Prestwold-in-Keythorp in the same county. He had issue by both marriages. Against the north wall of the chancel in Sandon Church is a colossal monument erected by himself in 1601, representing his own figure, 6 ft. 10½ in. in length. In two niches above are seen his two wives kneeling. The monument, which bears an inscription giving the descent of the family from 20th William I, was tampered with about 1756, when the chancel was repaired; originally it must have stood nearly twenty feet. An engraving of it in its first state faces p. 41 of Harwood's 1844 edition of the 'Survey.' From his will, or rather indenture, of 15 May 1603, made between him and four Staffordshire gentlemen, proved in P. C. C. 6 Oct. 1603 (registered 82, Bolein), it would seem that Erdeswicke died insolvent. Two children only are mentioned, his daughters Mary and Margery Erdeswicke. He is said to have been a member of the Society of Antiquaries, founded by Archbishop Parker about 1572 (*Archæologia*, i. ix).

Contemporary allusions to Erdeswicke attest the value and thoroughness of his work. In a well-known passage Camden celebrated him as 'venerandæ antiquitatis cultor maximus' (*Britannia*, ed. 1607, p. 439). William Burton writes in a similar strain in a Latin preface evidently intended for his 'Leicestershire,' first printed by Stebbing Shaw in the 'Gentleman's Magazine,' vol. lxviii. pt. ii. p. 1011. Many years later Fuller acknowledged the assistance he had derived from the 'Survey' (*Worthies*, ed. 1662, 'Staffordshire,' p. 46). The 'Survey,' with Degge's letter, was first printed by Curll, entitled 'A Survey of Staffordshire. . . . With a description of Beeston Castle in Cheshire; publish'd from Sir W. Dugdale's transcript of the author's original copy. To which are added, Observations on the possessors of monastery-lands in Staffordshire: by Sir S. Degge,' 8vo, Lon-

don, 1717. The copy in the British Museum has copious manuscript notes by Peter Le Neve, Norroy. According to Gough only the latter portion of this most inaccurate edition was printed from Dugdale's copy; the earlier part was supplied from a manuscript lent by Thoresby (*British Topography*, ii. 229–30). Gough is evidently right (cf. SALT, *List*, pp. 21–2; HARWOOD, *Erdeswicke*, 1844, pp. xcix–c). Both parts were reissued, 8vo, London, 1723. It was also incorporated in Shaw's unfinished 'History of Staffordshire,' fol., London, 1798–1801. Another edition, 'collated with manuscript copies, and with additions and corrections, by Wyrley, Chetwynd, Degge, Smyth, Lyttelton, Buckeridge, and others,' was published by Thomas Harwood, 8vo, Westminster, 1820 (new edit. 8vo, London, 1844). Erdeswicke is also said to have written, or at least revised, 'The true Use of Armorie,' published under the name of William Wyrley, his pupil and amanuensis, 4to, London, 1592. Wood, who possessed the original manuscript, much injured by damp, maintained that Wyrley was the sole author, 'and that Erdeswyke being oftentimes crazed, especially in his last days, and fit then for no kind of serious business, would say anything which came into his mind, as 'tis very well known at this day among the chief of the College of Arms' (*Athenæ Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, ii. 217–18). Dugdale, however, was of a different opinion (*The Antient Usage of bearing Arms*, ed. 1681, p. 4), adding in a note: 'I was assured by Mr. William Burton . . . that Mr. Erdeswicke did to him acknowledge he was the author of that discourse; though he gave leave to Mr. Wyrley . . . to publish it in his own name.' The two poems 'The Life of Sir John Chandos' and 'The Life of Sir John de Gralhy Capitall de Buz,' prefixed to the tract, were certainly written by Wyrley.

[Erdeswicke's Survey of Staffordshire, ed. Harwood, 1844, pp. xxxvi–xliii, 47, 48, 54; Fuller's Worthies (1662), Staffordshire, pp. 45–6; Wood's Athenæ Oxon. (Bliss), i. 736–7, ii. 217–19; Ormerod's Cheshire, i. xvii, iii. 119, 240; Gillow's Bibliographical Dict. of the English Catholics, ii. 174–6; Chalmers's Biog. Dict. xiii. 283; Gower's Sketch of the Materials for a Hist. of Cheshire (1771), pp. 30–1; Gough's British Topography, i. 249, ii. 229–30, 239; Hist. MSS. Comm. 2nd Rep. App. p. 49, 4th Rep. App. p. 362, 5th Rep. App. p. 339, 6th Rep. App. p. 246, 8th Rep. App. p. 31; Coxe's Cat. Codicum MSS. Bibl. Bodl. (Rawlinson), pars v. fasc. ii. p. 692; Moule's Bibliotheca Heraldica, p. 41.] G. G.

ERIGENA, JOHN SCOTUS (*d.* 875) [See SCOTUS.]

ERKENWALD or EARCONWALD, SAINT (*d.* 693), bishop of London, is said to have been born at Stallington (Stallingborough?) in Lindsey, of the family of Offa, a king of the East Angles (CAPGRAVE, *Acta SS. Bolland.* 30 April, iii. 790), which Dr. Stubbs suggests may mean that he belonged to the royal race of the Uffings (*Dict. of Christian Biography*). Before he became bishop he founded two monasteries, one at Chertsey in Surrey, over which he presided himself, and the other at Barking in Essex, which he committed to the care of his sister Æthelburh or Ethelburga [q. v.] In his foundation at Chertsey he is said to have been assisted by Frithewald, under-king of Surrey under Wulfhere, king of the Mercians (FLOR. WIG.; *Gesta Pontiff.* 143), and this statement is to some extent confirmed by some spurious charters (KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 986 sq.), from which it may be inferred that Chertsey was founded in the reign of Ecgberht of Kent (*d.* 673), and passed under Frithewald, the lieutenant of Wulfhere, when the Mercian king spread his dominion over Surrey (STUBBS; GREEN). On the death of Bishop Wini, and during the reign of the East-Saxon kings Sebbi and Sighere, Archbishop Theodore, either in 675 or 676, consecrated Earconwald to the bishopric of the East-Saxons, and he had his episcopal see in London. He was famed for his holiness. When he was infirm he was drawn about his diocese in a horse-litter, which was reverently preserved after his death, and in the time of Bæda worked many miracles (*Hist. Eccl.* iv. 6). By Theodore's invitation he was present at the reconciliation made at London in 686 between the archbishop and Wilfrith (EDDI, c. 43). Ini, in the preface to his laws made about 690, when the East Saxons had submitted to him, speaks of Earconwald as 'my bishop' (THORPE), and he and Wilfrith join in attesting a charter (KEMBLE, *Codex Dipl.* 35), which was probably made during Wilfrith's exile in 692 (STUBBS). His death may have taken place in 693, and very likely on 30 April, which was observed as his 'day.' He is said to have died at Barking, and the canons of his church and the monks of Chertsey are represented as disputing with the nuns for the possession of his body. The canons had the best of the quarrel, but their victory was endangered by the sudden rising of the waters of the Lea, which had been swollen by a storm. A miracle overcame the difficulty, and the body was carried to London and laid in St. Paul's. A new shrine was made for him in 1140, and his body was translated to the 'east side of the wall above the high altar' on

14 Nov. 1148 (Matt. West. ii. 40; Dugdale). In 1386 Bishop Braybroke [q. v.] decreed that the days of the saint's death and translation, which had of late been neglected, should be kept holy, and they were observed with great honour as first-class feasts at St. Paul's (Stubbs). A spurious privilege, purporting to be a grant of Pope Agatho to St. Paul's, is said to have been brought from Rome by Earconwald, to whom it is addressed; another privilege, also spurious, to the monastery of Chertsey is addressed to the bishop (*Councils and Eccl. Docs.* iii. 161). There is no historical foundation for the belief that he visited Rome. His chief claim to remembrance is that he must have developed the organisation of the diocese 'from the missionary stage in which Cedda had left it' (Stubbs). An exhaustive discussion by Bishop Stubbs, on the chronology of his episcopate, and full particulars of the legends relating to him, and of the reverence paid to his memory, will be found in the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography.'

[Bædæ Hist. Eccles. iv. 6; Kemble's Codex Dipl. 35, 986–8; Eddi, Vita Wilfridi, c. 43; Historians of York, 1 (Rolls Ser.); Florence of Worcester, sub ann. 675; William of Malmesbury, Gesta Pontificum, p. 143 (Rolls Ser.); Life from Capgrave in Acta SS. Bolland. 30 April, iii. 790; another life from Cotton MS., Claudius, A 5, printed in Dugdale's History of St. Paul's (ed. 1818), p. 289, see also p. 15; Thorpe's Ancient Laws, p. 45; Green's Making of England, pp. 328, 330; art. 'Erkenwald,' Dict. of Christian Biog. ii. 177–9.] W. H.

ERLE, THOMAS (1650?–1720), general, of Charborough, Dorsetshire, was second son of Thomas Erle, who married Susan, fourth daughter of the first Lord Say and Sele (Collins, vi. 32), and died during the lifetime of his father, Sir Walter Erle, knt., the parliamentarian, who died in 1665 (Hutchins, *Dorsetshire*, iii. 126). Thomas Erle appears to have succeeded to the family estates at the death of his grandfather (*ib.*), and in 1678 was returned to parliament for the borough of Wareham, Dorsetshire, which he represented many years. On 27 May 1685 he was appointed a deputy lieutenant for Dorsetshire, and a letter of the same date to 'Mr. Thomas Erle of Charborough' directs him, in the absence of the lieutenant (Lord Bristol), to do 'all manner of acts and things concerning the militia which three or more deputy lieutenants are by the statute empowered to do' (*Home Off. Mil. Entry Book*, i. 184). His appointment as deputy lieutenant is the first mention of his name in existing war office (home office) records. On 13 June following similar letters were issued to two other deputy lieutenants of Dorsetshire, Colonel Strangways, of the 'western regiment of foot,' and Sir Henry Portman, bart., who were further directed, if necessary, to march the militia out of the county. This was the date on which the 'red' regiment of Dorsetshire militia entered Bridport to oppose the Duke of Monmouth's advance (Macaulay, *History*, vol. i.) Drax, Erle's successor in the Charborough estates, caused an inscription to be put up over an ice-house in the grounds recording that 'under this roof, in the year 1686, a set of patriotic gentlemen of this neighbourhood concerted the great plan of the glorious revolution with the immortal King William . . .' (Hutchins, iii. 128). According to Narcissus Luttrell, who styles him 'major,' Erle was raising men after William of Orange landed (*Relation of State Affairs*, i. 482). On 8 March 1689 he was appointed colonel of a new regiment of foot, with which he went to Ireland and fought at the battle of the Boyne and the siege of Limerick in 1690, and in the campaign of 1691, where he much distinguished himself at the battle of Aghrim, in which he was twice taken by the Irish and as often rescued by his own men. Erle, who is described by General Mackay at this time as a man of very good sense, a hearty lover of his country and likewise of his bottle, had meanwhile been transferred, on 1 Jan. 1691, to the colonelcy of Luttrell's regiment (19th foot), which he took to Flanders and commanded at the battle of Steinkirk, 3 Aug. 1692. The same year he made his only recorded speech in the house in the debate on the employment of foreign generals (*Parl. Hist.* v. 718). Erle was made a brigadier-general 22 March 1693, and left a sick bed at Mechlin to head his brigade at the battle of Landen, where he was badly wounded. About the end of the year his name appears as a subscriber of 2,333*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* to the 'General Joint Stock for East India' under the charter of 11 Nov. 1693 (*All Souls' Coll. MS.* 152D, fol. 45 *b*). He commanded a brigade in the subsequent campaigns in Flanders, and was with the covering army during the siege of Namur. In June 1696 Erle, who had been made governor of Plymouth, became a major-general, and in 1697 his original regiment, referred to in some official records under the misleading title of the '1st battalion of Erle's' (*Treas. Papers*, lx. 20, 21), was disbanded. In 1699 Erle was appointed second in command under Lord Galway in Ireland, and on the accession of Queen Anne was made commander-in-chief there, and for a time was one of the lords justices. Some of his official letters to Hyde, earl of Rochester,

at this time are among the Hyde Papers in the British Museum (*Add. MS.* 15895), including 'Proposals for the Defence of Ireland during ye Warre' (*ib.* fol. 265). In 1703 he became a lieutenant-general, and was made lieutenant of the ordnance on the recommendation of Marlborough and summoned to England (*Marl. Desp.* i. 612), where among other services he raised a regiment of dragoons for Ireland (disbanded later), the colonelcy of which was given to Lord Cutts [q. v.], who succeeded Erle in the Irish command in 1705 (*Treas. Papers*, xcv. 62). In 1706 he was appointed to a command in the expedition under Lord Rivers, and Marlborough, who appears to have appreciated Erle's good sense and trustworthiness, writing to him in Dorsetshire 29 July 1706, apologises 'for contributing to calling you away from so agreeable a retirement, which I should not have done if I had not thought it absolutely necessary to the service that a person of your experience and authority should be joined with Lord Rivers in his expedition' (*Marl. Desp.* iii. 34). Erle proceeded to Spain in January 1707 (*ib.* iii. 293), and appears to have commanded the centre at the battle of Almanza, 23 April 1707. He returned home in March 1708, and soon after was appointed commander-in-chief of a combined expedition to the coast of France (commission in *Treas. Papers*, cvii. 62). The troops were put on board Sir George Byng's fleet, and, after some unimportant movements between the Downs and the French coast, were landed at Ostend and employed there during the siege of Lille (see *Marl. Desp.* vol. iv.) At the end of the year Erle, whose health was much broken by repeated attacks of gout, returned home. In 1709 he sold the colonelcy of his regiment (19th foot) to the lieutenant-colonel, George Freke. He retained the lieutenancy of the ordnance, and was appointed commander-in-chief in South Britain and governor of Portsmouth. In 1711 he was made a general of foot in Flanders, in succession to Charles Churchill, but never took up the appointment. In 1712 he was removed from his posts at the ordnance and as commander-in-chief on political grounds. Except in 1715, when he was sent down to put Portsmouth in a state of defence, he was not employed again. He died at Charborough 23 July 1720, and was buried in the vault of the parish church beside his wife, Elizabeth, second daughter of Sir William Wyndham, bart., of Orchard Wyndham, Somersetshire, who died before him. By her he left one child, a daughter, who married Sir Edward Ernle, third baronet, of Maddington, Wiltshire, and died in 1728 (see Burke, *Extinct Baronetages*, under 'Ernley'). Her second daughter married Henry Drax of Ellerlee Abbey, Yorkshire, some time secretary to Frederick, prince of Wales. Drax thus succeeded to the Charborough property, which is held by his descendants. Erle represented the borough of Wareham in every parliament from 1678 to 1718, except in 1698, when he was returned for Portsmouth with Admiral Sir George Rooke. He was returned for Portsmouth and Wareham in 1702 and again in 1708, and each time elected to sit for Wareham. He resigned his seat on receiving a pension of 1,200*l.* a year in 1718 (*Off. List Members of Parliament*). His portrait was painted by Kneller and engraved by J. Simson. There was a Thomas Erle appointed major and exempt in the 3rd troop of horse guards in 1702 (*Home Off. Mil. Entry Book*, v. 87), who is believed to have been father of Major-general Thomas Erle, colonel 28th foot, who died in 1777.

[Hutchins's Dorsetshire (1813), pp. 126–9; Granger's Biog. Hist. ii. 197; Collins's Peerage, 5th ed. vi. 32; D'Auvergne's Narratives of Campaigns in Flanders; Marl. Desp. Hutchins mentions that a collection of Erle's letters to the Earl of Rochester is or was in the library at Charborough; some are in the Hyde Papers in British Museum, Add. MS. 15895; others in the Marquis of Ormonde's, see Hist. MSS. Comm. 7th Rep. Incidental notices of Erle will be found in Luttrell's Relation of State Affairs, vols. i–vi.; in Treasury Papers, indexed in Calendars of Treasury Papers, 1702–9, 1709–14; in Home Off. Military Entry Books, i–viii. which are in Public Record Office, London; and in All Souls' Coll. MSS. 152A ff. 53, 54, 54 *b*, 152D ff. 21, 22 *b*, 45 *b*, 152E ff. 5 *b*, 162, 163 *b*, 152F f., 154 f. 120.] H. M. C.

ERLE, Sir WILLIAM (1793–1880), judge, son of the Rev. Christopher Erle of Gillingham, Dorsetshire, by Margaret, daughter of Thomas Bowles of Shaftesbury in the same county, a relative of the poet William Lisle Bowles, born at Fifehead-Magdalen, Dorsetshire, on 1 Oct. 1793, was educated at Winchester and New College, Oxford, where he graduated B.C.L. in 1818, and held a fellowship until 1834. He was called to the bar at the Middle Temple on 26 Nov. 1819. His circuit was the western. Here he slowly acquired a reputation for thoroughness rather than brilliancy, and a fair share of remunerative practice. He was admitted a member of the Inner Temple on 11 June 1822, and became a bencher of that society on 18 Nov. 1834. He married in 1834 Amelia, eldest daughter of the Rev. Dr. Williams, warden of New College and prebendary of Winchester, thereby vacating his fellowship. The same

year he took silk. He was returned to parliament in the liberal interest for the city of Oxford in 1837, but declined to seek re-election in 1841. He never spoke in the house, but voted steadily with his party. He was appointed counsel to the Bank of England in 1844, and became serjeant-at-law the same year. He accepted a puisne judgeship of the common pleas from Lord Lyndhurst in 1845, being then knighted, was transferred to the queen's bench in the following year, and on 24 June 1859 succeeded Cockburn (raised to the lord chief justiceship of England) as lord chief justice of the common pleas, being at the same time sworn of the privy council. He retired in 1866. On the last occasion of his sitting in court (26 Nov.) the attorney-general, Sir John Rolt, on behalf of the bar, expressed his sense of the great qualities of which Erle had given proof during his tenure of office, in terms so eulogistic that the judge, though naturally somewhat reserved and undemonstrative, was visibly moved. He was regarded as what lawyers call a 'strong' judge, i.e. he exhibited the power of rapidly grasping the material facts of a case, and coming to a decided conclusion upon their legal effect. There is no doubt that he aimed at strict impartiality, but at the same time he was very tenacious of his own opinion. His chief characteristic was masculine sense, his mind was lacking in flexibility and subtlety. His elocution was deliberate even to monotony, and his accent was slightly tinged with provincialism. His personal appearance was that of a country gentleman, his complexion being remarkably fresh and ruddy, his eyes keen and bright. He was a member of the Trades Union Commission of 1867, and appended to the report of the commissioners, published in 1868, a memorandum on the law relating to trades unions, which he published separately in the following year. It consists of two chapters treating respectively of the common and the statute law relating to the subject, and an appendix on certain leading cases and statutes, and is a very lucid exposition of the law as it then stood. During the rest of his life Erle resided chiefly at his modest seat, Bramshott, near Liphook, Hampshire, interesting himself in parochial and county affairs. Though no sportsman he was very fond of horses, dogs, and cattle. He died on 28 Jan. 1880, leaving no issue. Except the work above referred to, 'The Law relating to Trades Unions,' 1869–80, he seems to have written nothing.

[Times, 30 Jan. 1880, p. 10; Cat. Oxford Graduates; Inns of Court Calendar, 1878; Law Mag. and Review, 4th ser. v. 191; Law Times, lxiii. 268; Solicitors' Journal, xxiv. 274.] J. M. R.

ERNEST AUGUSTUS, Duke of York and Albany (1674–1728), the fifth son of Ernest Augustus, elector of Hanover, by the Princess Sophia, and therefore brother to George I, was born on 17 Sept. 1674. He was trained as a soldier, and served with some distinction under the emperor. Visiting England after the accession of his brother, he was created Duke of York and Albany and Earl of Ulster on 29 June 1716, and was, together with his great-nephew Frederick, afterwards Prince of Wales, elected a knight of the Garter. He returned to Germany, and resided there as Prince Bishop of Osnaburg, which title was conferred on him 2 March 1716, till his death, which took place in 1728. The fact of his existence was scarcely known to the majority of the British nation.

[Noble's Continuation of Granger, iii. 9; Historical Account of George Lewis, king of Great Britain.] A. V.

ERNEST AUGUSTUS, Duke of Cumberland and King of Hanover (1771–1851), fifth son of George III and Queen Charlotte, born at Kew on 5 June 1771, was baptised at St. James's Palace by Archbishop Cornwallis on 1 July following. His sponsors were Prince Ernest of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, from whom he received his name, Prince Maurice of Saxe-Gotha, and the Hereditary Grand Duchess of Hesse-Cassel. He was educated at Kew with his younger brothers, and his first tutors were the Rev. G. Cookson, afterwards canon of Windsor, and Dr. Hughes, who regarded him as a far more promising lad than his brothers. He was destined by his father from the first to be the commander-in-chief of the Hanoverian army, and in 1786 he was sent to the university of Göttingen with his younger brothers. Among his teachers at Göttingen were Heyne, the classical scholar, and General Malortie, who was his tutor in military subjects.

Before leaving England Prince Ernest was installed a knight of the Garter on 2 June 1786, and on completing his education in 1790 he was gazetted a lieutenant in the 9th Hanoverian hussars, of which regiment he was appointed lieutenant-colonel in 1793. His military training was superintended by Lieutenant-general Baron Linsingen, and on the outbreak of war in 1793 his regiment was sent to the front with a division of the Hanoverian army under the command of General Walmoden. Prince Ernest served with the Hanoverians through the campaigns of 1793 and 1794 in Belgium and the north-west of France. In the campaign of 1793 the Hanoverians were generally kept in reserve, but in 1794 the Duke of York was obliged to make

use of all the troops under his command. In February 1794 Prince Ernest was gazetted a major-general both in the English and the Hanoverian armies, and when the campaign opened he was appointed to the command of the first brigade of Hanoverian cavalry in charge of the outposts. In this capacity he was constantly engaged with the enemy, and in the first battle of Tournay, on 10 May 1794, he lost his left eye and was severely wounded in the right arm in a hand-to-hand conflict. These wounds made it necessary for him to return to England, but he hurried back to the army in the November of the same year before they were thoroughly healed. He was again conspicuous for his personal bravery in the field, and in the sortie from Nimeguen on 10 Dec. 1794 he lifted a French dragoon right off his horse and carried him prisoner into the English camp. Prince Ernest then commanded the Hanoverian cavalry of the rear guard all through the terrible winter retreat before the advancing French army, and he remained at his post until the English troops returned to England and the Hanoverians to Hanover in February 1795.

In 1796 Prince Ernest returned to England with a high military reputation for courage, and in 1798 he was promoted lieutenant-general and made governor of Chester. On 4 April 1799 George III created his four younger sons peers of the realm. Prince Ernest became Duke of Cumberland and of Teviotdale in the peerage of Great Britain, and Earl of Armagh in the peerage of Ireland. Parliament also granted him an income of 12,000*l.* a year, which was in 1804 increased to 18,000*l.* In the same year (1799) the duke was appointed to command the division of cavalry which was to support the expedition of the Duke of York to the Helder, but owing to the immediate failure of the campaign the cavalry never embarked. On 28 March 1801 he was appointed colonel of the 15th hussars, and in 1803 he was promoted general; he also received some lucrative military commands, such as that of the Severn district, which he held from 1801 to 1804, and of the south-western district, from 1804 to 1807. Far more important than these military commands was the commencement of Cumberland's political career. He soon gained an important influence over the mind of the Prince of Wales, and in the House of Lords he showed himself a clear, if not very eloquent, speaker and a ready debater. He was a constant attendant at debates, and soon obtained much weight in the councils of his party. From the first he took his place as a tory partisan and a supporter of the protestant religion. His first speech in parliament was delivered in opposition to the Adultery Prevention Bill in 1800, and in 1803 he seconded an address from the House of Lords in reply to an address from the crown, in a speech vigorously attacking the ambition of Napoleon. He was elected chancellor of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1805 and grand master of the Orange lodges of Ireland two years later. In 1808 he presented a petition from the Dublin corporation to the House of Lords with a speech in which he declared his undying opposition to any relief of the penal laws against the catholics. In 1810 the tory ministry introduced a regency bill, intended to limit the prerogatives of the Prince of Wales on account of his supposed sympathy with the whigs, when Cumberland at once told the ministers that they were filled with a false idea of his eldest brother's character, and both spoke and voted against them. This conduct strengthened his influence alike over the prince regent and the Duke of York. When his prophecy came true, and the prince regent maintained the tory ministry in power in 1812, the ministers too felt the perspicuity of Cumberland, and admitted him freely to their councils. This alliance with the tories exasperated both the whig leaders and the radical agitators and journalists.

On the night of 31 May 1810 the duke was found in his apartments in St. James's Palace with a terrible wound on his head, which would have been mortal had not the assassin's weapon struck against the duke's sword. Shortly afterwards his valet, Sellis, was found dead in his bed with his throat cut. On hearing the evidence of the surgeons and other witnesses, the coroner's jury returned a verdict that Sellis had committed suicide after attempting to assassinate the duke. The absence of any reasonable motive (see, however, Col. Willis's 'Diary MS.,' quoted in Jesse, *Life of George III*, iii. 545, 546) caused this event to be greatly discussed, and democratic journalists did not hesitate to accuse the duke of horrible crimes, and even to hint that he really murdered Sellis. In 1813 Henry White was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment and a fine of 200*l.* for publishing this rumour.

In the short campaign of 1806, under Lord Cathcart (1755–1843) [q. v.], the duke commanded a Hanoverian division, and after the battle of Leipzig, at which he was present as a spectator, he took over the electorate of Hanover in his father's name, and raised a fresh Hanoverian army, at the head of which he served during the campaigns of 1813 and 1814 in France. At the opening of the campaign of 1813 Cumberland was promoted to be a field-marshal in the British army, and in January 1815 he was made a G.C.B. on the

extension of the order of the Bath. It now became apparent that the duke might possibly succeed to the throne of England. He accordingly married at Strelitz on 29 May 1815 his cousin, Frederica Caroline Sophia Alexandrina, daughter of the Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, and widow of Prince Frederick of Prussia and of Prince Frederick of Solms-Braunfels. This marriage, solemnised according to the rites of the English church on 29 Aug. 1815 at Carlton House, received the consent of the prince regent, but was most obnoxious to Queen Charlotte, who until the end of her life absolutely refused to receive the Duchess of Cumberland. It was not popular among the English people, who were prejudiced against the duke, and even the tory House of Commons refused to grant him the increase in his income, from 18,000*l.* to 24,000*l.* a year, which was subsequently granted to the Dukes of Clarence, Kent, and Cambridge.

The accession of the prince regent as George IV greatly increased Cumberland's power. His influence over the king was only rivalled by that of the Marchioness of Conyngham, and Greville's 'Journals' show how that influence was consistently maintained. The duke had the power of a strong mind over a weak one, and this influence, always exercised in the tory interest, caused him to be absolutely loathed by the radical journalists. Yet he sought no wealth or honour for himself, and the only appointment he received was in January 1827, the colonelcy of the royal horse guards (the blues). The death of the Princess Charlotte, and then that of the Duke of York, brought him nearer to the throne, and his policy was closely watched. He opposed the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts with vigour, and when the Catholic Emancipation Bill was introduced into the House of Lords he said: 'I will act as I believe my sainted father would wish me to act, and that is to oppose to the utmost the dangerous measure, and to withdraw all confidence from the dangerous men who are forcing it through parliament.'

The accession of William IV put an end to Cumberland's influence on English politics. One of the first measures of the new reign was the placing of the royal horse guards under the authority of the commander-in-chief of the army. This measure was contrary to old precedent. Cumberland regarded it as a personal insult to himself, and at once resigned the colonelcy of the blues. He continued to attend regularly in the House of Lords, and energetically opposed the Reform Bill of 1832, the Municipal Corporations Reform Bill, and the new poor law. This conduct made the duke still more obnoxious to the radical press and to the whig statesmen, and in 1832 a pamphleteer named Joseph Phillips published the statement that 'the general opinion was that his royal highness had been the murderer of his servant Sellis.' The duke prosecuted the pamphleteer, who was immediately found guilty by the jury without retiring, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment. Lord Brougham in the House of Lords went nearly as far, and deliberately called him to his face 'the illustrious duke—illustrious only by courtesy.' William IV did not hesitate to insult his brother also, and in 1833, full of reforming ardour, he granted a liberal constitution to his Hanoverian dominions, which was drawn up by Professor Dahlmann. This constitution was submitted by the king to his brothers, the Duke of Sussex and the Duke of Cambridge, who was governing Hanover as viceroy, but it was not even laid before Cumberland, the heir presumptive to the throne of Hanover. A further accusation was made openly in the House of Commons. The duke had been since 1817 grand master of the Irish Orangemen, and he was accused of making use of this position to pose as the defender of protestantism, and to tamper with the loyalty of the army. These accusations were only set at rest by the duke's categorical denial, and by the assistance he rendered in suppressing the whole of the Orange societies at the request of the government.

Upon the accession of Queen Victoria to the throne of England, the duke, under the regulations of the Salic law, succeeded to the German dominions of his family as King Ernest I of Hanover. He first took the oath of allegiance to the queen as an English peer, and then started for Hanover, where he took over the administration of his new kingdom from the Duke of Cambridge, who had acted as viceroy during the two preceding reigns. He at once cancelled the constitution, which had been granted by William IV, and assumed absolute power, a proceeding which drew down upon him the hatred of the liberal parties, both in England and in Hanover. The Hanoverian radicals conspired against him and projected open rebellion, and in the English House of Commons Colonel Perronet Thompson proposed that he should be deprived of his right to succeed to the throne if Queen Victoria should die. The fact that he was the next heir to the throne was the reason which urged the whig cabinet to hurry on the queen's marriage; and King Ernest, who had commenced his reign by quarrelling with the queen about the Hanover crown

jewels, loudly protested against her marriage, and refused to be present at it.

The reign of King Ernest was popular in Hanover. The personal interest which he took in the affairs of his people, compared with the absenteeism of his three immediate predecessors, compensated to a great extent for his unbending toryism. In 1840, when his power was firmly established, he granted his subjects a new constitution, which was based upon modern ideas, and, while maintaining the privileges of the aristocracy, recognised the right of the people to representation. The care which he took of the material interests of his people, his accessibility, and the way in which he identified himself with Hanover, made up for his roughness of manner and confidence in himself. In 1848 he was supported by his people, and was able to suppress with ease the beginnings of revolt. In England he became yet more unpopular owing to his conduct with regard to the Stade tolls (see *The Stade Duties Considered*, by William Hutt, M.P., London, 1839). Scandals, too, were associated with his name by the conduct of Mrs. Olivia Serres, who called herself Princess Olive of Cumberland, and claimed to be the king's legitimate daughter. The king continued his interest in English politics; constantly corresponded with his old friends and the leaders of the tory party, and never swerved from the opinions of his youth. He had many domestic misfortunes; in 1841 he lost his wife, and his only son, afterwards George V of Hanover, was afflicted with total blindness.

An interesting account of the court of Ernest of Hanover has been published by his English domestic chaplain ('The Court and Times of King Ernest of Hanover,' by the Rev. C. Allix Wilkinson), from which it appears that the character of the monarch remained the same throughout his life. He was always a plain, downright man, and his manners are well summed in the words of William IV, which were quoted to Mr. Wilkinson by Dean Wellesley: 'Ernest is not a bad fellow, but if any one has a corn he is sure to tread on it.' Of all the sons of George III he was the one who had the strongest will, the best intellect, and greatest courage.

King Ernest died on 18 Nov. 1851 at his palace of Herrenhausen, at the age of eighty, and was buried on the 26th amidst the universal grief of his people. 'I have no objection to my body being exposed to the view of my loyal subjects,' he wrote in his will, 'that they may cast a last look at me, who never had any other object or wish than to contribute to their welfare and happiness, who have never consulted my own interests, while I endeavoured to correct the abuses and supply the wants which have arisen during a period of 150 years' absenteeism, and which are sufficiently explained by that fact.' The inscription affixed to the statue of King Ernest in the Grande Place of Hanover bears the words, 'Dem Landes Vater sein treues Volk.'

[There is no good biography of King Ernest of Hanover extant; of the obituary notices the most valuable are those in the Times, the Examiner, and in the Gent. Mag. for January 1852; for his military career see Jones's Narrative of the War in the Low Countries (London, 1795), the biographies in Philippart's Royal Military Calendar, and the record of the 15th hussars; for the attack on his life by Sellis, Jesse's Life of George III, iii. 541–6, and Rose's Diaries and Correspondence, ii. 437–46; for his quarrel with William IV see Stocqueler's Hist. of the Royal Horse Guards; for his political career the newspapers of the time, and all the memoirs and journals, especially Pellew's Life of Lord Sidmouth and the Greville Journals; and for his later life Reminiscences of the Court and Times of King Ernest of Hanover, by the Rev. C. A. Wilkinson.] H. M. S.

ERNULF or **ARNULF** (1040–1124), bishop of Rochester, was of French birth ('natione Gallus'), and brought up in Normandy at the famous monastery of the Bec, where Lanfranc his teacher and Anselm, his senior by about seven years, became lifelong friends. Ernulf, too, entered the order of St. Benedict, and long lived as a brother of the monastery of St. Lucian at Beauvais. It is probable that he is the Arnulf 'the grammarian' to whom St. Anselm refers (*Ep.* lv.) as proficient in the accidence ('in declinationibus'), congratulating one Maurice for having the advantage of his instruction. But after a while the disorder occasioned by certain unruly elements in the house—we are left to guess the precise cause—made Ernulf seek another abode. He consulted his old master Lanfranc, now (it is implied) archbishop of Canterbury, who recommended him to come to England 'quia ibi [at Beauvais] animam suam salvare non posset.' So to Canterbury, some time after 1070, he came, and dwelt with the monks of Christ Church for all the days of Lanfranc, who died in 1089, and was made prior by Archbishop Anselm. He was careful for the fabric of the cathedral, and carried on Anselm's work, during his exile, of rebuilding the choir on a much extended and far grander plan than the previous structure of Lanfranc. The new choir was distinguished by its splendour of marbles and paintings, and of glass such as could nowhere else be seen in England.

Ernulf was held in repute as an authority on canon law, and was consulted on various nice points by Bishop Walkelin of Winchester, to whom he addressed a 'Tomellus sive Epistola de Incestis Coniugiis.' The date of this treatise is between 1089 (since it mentions Lanfranc as dead) and 1098 (when Walkelin himself died). It is printed in Luc d'Achery's 'Spicilegium,' iii. 464–70 (ed. L. de la Barre, 1723), where it is wrongly dated 1115, and in Migne's 'Patrologiæ Cursus Compl.' ser. Lat. clxiii. p. 1457. Another letter, written chiefly on the sacramental controversy, to Lambert, abbot of St. Bertin ('Epistola solutiones quasdam continens ad varias Lamberti abbatis Bertiniani quæstiones, præcipue de corpore et sanguine Domini,' printed in L. d'Achery, ubi supra, iii. 470–4), probably belongs to the same period of Ernulf's life. It was composed in or after 1095. A beautiful manuscript, written in the early part of the twelfth century, once forming part of the library of St. Albans Abbey, and now preserved at Oxford (Cod. Bodl. 569), contains the work in immediate association with the kindred treatises of Archbishop Guitmund of Aversa, of Lanfranc, and of Anselm. Testimony to the affection with which Ernulf was regarded by his neighbours at Canterbury may be found in two poems addressed to him by Raginald, monk of St. Augustine's, and recently printed by Dr. Liebermann (*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 1888, xiii. 537, et seq.)

In 1107, through the influence of Anselm, Ernulf was promoted to the important abbacy of Peterborough, where his rule was remembered not only by his businesslike activity, but also by his personal saintliness and mild and gracious bearing. His popularity had its witness in the increased number of the monks. At Peterborough, as at Canterbury, he built considerable additions, but these were destroyed by fire; and he was just planning a new building when he was called to the see of Rochester, on the advancement of its bishop, Ralph, to that of Canterbury in 1114. King Henry, says the 'Peterborough Chronicle,' was on his way to the continent when he was detained at Burne (Eastbourne) by stress of weather. While waiting there he sent for the abbot of Peterborough to come to him in haste, and on his arrival urged him to accept the bishopric of Rochester. The suggestion was Archbishop Ralph's (Eadmer, *Hist. Nov.* p. 225; Gervase of Canterbury, *Op. Hist.* ii. 377), and was supported by the prelates and barons present, but Ernulf long withstood. The king then ordered the archbishop to lead him to Canterbury and there bless him to bishop, 'wolde he, nolde he;' and thus it seems Ernulf was constrained to yield 19 Sept. 1114. But the monks of Peterborough were sorry, for that he was a very good and meek man, and did full well for his monastery, both within and without.

The statement (Le Neve, *Fasti Eccl. Angl.* ii. 558, ed. Hardy) that Florence of Worcester (*Chron.* ii. 67, ed. B. Thorpe, 1849) and Symeon of Durham (*Hist. Reg.*, ad an., ii. 248, ed. T. Arnold, 1885) date Ernulf's election as bishop on 15 Aug. rests on an apparent misreading of the text. He was invested at Canterbury 28 Sept., installed at Rochester 10 Oct. (Eadmer, l. c.), and consecrated at Canterbury in company with Geoffrey, bishop of Hereford, 26 Dec. (*ib.* p. 236). Of his pontifical career little is related beyond his assistance at consecrations of other bishops. The confidence which he still enjoyed among the monks of Canterbury is shown by the appeal they made to him in 1123 to support their protest against the appointment of any one but a monk to be their archbishop (Gervase of Canterbury, ii. 380). But Ernulf was already declining in health, and died not long after (15 March 1124), being eighty-four years of age.

Besides the two letters already mentioned Ernulf was the author of a great collection of documents relating to the church of Rochester, English laws (from Æthelberht onwards), papal decrees, and other materials for English and ecclesiastical history. This famous work, known as the 'Textus Roffensis,' is preserved among the muniments of Rochester Cathedral. Extracts were printed by Wharton, 'Anglia Sacra,' i. 329–40 (1691), and Wilkins, 'Leges Anglo-Saxonicæ' (1721); and the whole was published by Thomas Hearne in 1720.

[William of Malmesbury's Gesta Pontificum Anglorum, p. 137 et seq. (ed N. E. S. A. Hamilton, 1870), and the Peterborough Chronicle (Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, i. 370, cf. 374, ed. B. Thorpe, 1861). There is a letter probably written to him by St. Anselm ('Clarissimo Arnulfo frater Anselmus salutem,' &c., ep. xxx. Op. p. 322 et seq., 2nd ed. Gerberon, 1721); and references in epp. lv. (p. 331) and lxv. (p. 336). See also Eadmer's Hist. Nov. pp. 291, 294, ed. M. Rule; Gervase of Canterbury's Oper. Hist. ii. 294, ed. W. Stubbs, besides the places cited in the text. C. E. du Boulay's Hist. Univ. Paris, i. 432, confounds our Ernulf with an earlier chanter of Chartres, a disciple of Fulbert, bishop of that see (*d.* 1029), while Bale's Scriptt. Brit. Cat. ii. 70, pp. 184 et seq., seems to mix him up with the famous Arnold of Brescia. Cf. Gunton's Hist. of the Church of Peterborough, pp. 20–1 (1686).] R. L. P.

ERRINGTON, ANTHONY, D.D. (1719?), catholic divine, was a member of the Northumbrian family. His name appears in a list of Douay writers, but he was more probably educated at Lisbon and Paris. He is said to have died about 1719.

He wrote: 1. 'Catechistical Discourses,' Paris, 1654, 16mo, dedicated to the 'Princesse Henrietta Maria, daughter of England.' 2. 'Missionarium: sive opusculum practicum, pro fide propaganda et conservanda,' Rome, 1672, 12mo.

[Catholic Mag. (1832), ii. 257; Dodd's Church Hist. iii. 295; Gillow's Bibl. Dict.] T. C.

ERRINGTON, GEORGE (1804–1886), catholic archbishop, the second of the three sons of Thomas Errington, esq., by Katherine, daughter of Walter Dowdall of Dublin, was born on 14 Sept. 1804, on his father's property at Clintz, near Richmond in Yorkshire. He was entered at St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, near Durham, 16 Aug. 1814, where he remained until August 1821. In October he started for Rome, where on 21 Nov. 1821 he was enrolled as an ecclesiastical student at the English College. In 1824 he received a 'proxime accessit' in dogmatic, and the second prize in scholastic theology. On 17 Dec. 1825 he was ordained subdeacon, and on 23 Dec. 1826 deacon, having in that year obtained a 'proxime accessit e schola locorum Theologicorum.' In 1827 he took his degree as doctor of divinity, and on 22 Dec. he was ordained priest in St. John Lateran. On Dr. (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman assuming the rectorship of the English College at Rome, Errington, on 29 May 1832, was appointed vice-rector. His health broke down and he travelled for eight years through France and Spain in company with his eldest brother, Michael, adding to his intimate knowledge of Italian a mastery of the French and Spanish languages. In 1840 he accompanied Mgr. Wiseman, then recently consecrated bishop of Melipotamus, to England. There they settled at St. Mary's College, Oscott, over which Errington presided from August 1843 to June 1847, Wiseman being then removed from the midland district to go as pro-vicar-apostolic to London. Errington went as a missionary priest in February 1848 to Liverpool, where he took charge of St. Nicholas's Chapel. Thence in July 1849 he was sent to St. John's Chapel in Salford, on the site of which he built the present St. John's Cathedral. On the establishment of the new catholic hierarchy in England, Errington, in September 1850, was nominated the first bishop of Plymouth. He received episcopal consecration in St. John's, Salford, on 25 July 1851 at the hands of Cardinal Wiseman. On 7 Aug. he took possession of his see in the chapel of St. Mary's, Plymouth. He left the diocese upon his nomination in March 1855 as coadjutor to Cardinal Wiseman, with the right of succession to the archdiocese of Westminster. In April 1855 Errington was translated to the archbishopric of Trebizond in partibus, and in June went to London to reside with Cardinal Wiseman. In October 1855 he was appointed administrator of the diocese of Clifton, and held the position for sixteen months. Prior Park was sold under Errington's direction, and the financial embarrassments of the diocese cleared up. On 5 Dec. 1856 he was made assistant at the pontifical throne, and in that capacity, on 15 Feb. 1857, was chosen by Pius IX to assist that pontiff in the consecration in the Sistine chapel of Dr. Clifford as bishop of Clifton. On 2 July 1862, in obedience to the decision of the sovereign pontiff, Errington was relieved from any further connection with the archdiocese of Westminster, it being deemed expedient that his association with Cardinal Wiseman in its governance should cease. Errington had long won to himself the title of the 'Iron Archbishop,' and Wiseman was made of less rigid materials. Twice after his removal from Westminster Errington was offered important sees by Pius IX, but he preferred to remain in retirement. In September 1865, however, he accepted, and held for more than three years, from Bishop Goss of Liverpool, charge of the missions in the Isle of Man. In 1868 he was elected by propaganda to be the apostolic delegate for the missions in Scotland, an appointment which he first accepted, but immediately afterwards resigned. From December 1869 to July 1870 he assisted as Archbishop of Trebizond at the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican. He returned home with Bishop Clifford, who had meanwhile repurchased Prior Park for the diocese of Clifton. Clifford induced him to undertake the tuition of the young theological students at St. Paul's College. He settled there in October 1870, and passed the happiest years of his life at Prior Park. He died at Prior Park on 19 Jan. 1886, and was buried on the 26th in the college church. He was a man of inflexible integrity and profound erudition.

[See Bishop Clifford's Discourse at Archbishop Errington's Funeral, 8vo, pp. 23; Times, 20 Jan. 1886; Maziere Brady's Episcopal Succession in England, &c., pp. 376, 436, 437, 473; Shepherd's Reminiscences of Prior Park College, p. 20; Dr. Oliver's Collections illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion in Cornwall, &c., pp. 297–299.] C. K.

ERRINGTON, JOHN EDWARD (1806–1862), civil engineer, eldest son of John Errington, was born at Hull 29 Dec. 1806. At an early age he was placed with an engineer officer then conducting extensive public works in Ireland. After a time he became assistant to Mr. Padley in the surveys which he made in the early stages of railways in England. This employment brought him into connection with Mr. Rastick, C.E., by whom he was engaged to help in the preparation of the plans for the Birmingham end of the Grand Junction railway. At this period he first met Joseph Locke [q. v.] When the Grand Junction railway came under the sole direction of Locke, he gave Errington an appointment as resident engineer, and entrusted to him the superintendence of the construction of a portion of the line. After the completion of that railway in 1837, he took charge of the line from Glasgow by Paisley to Greenock, and in 1841 laid out and constructed the harbour works of the latter seaport. In 1843, in conjunction with Locke, he made the plans for the Lancaster and Carlisle railway, the works on which were carried out under his sole charge. He also constructed the Caledonian railway, 1848, the Clydesdale Junction railway, the Scottish Central, the Scottish Midland Junction, and the Aberdeen railway; and he either brought forward or was consulted about the entire system of railways from Lancaster to Inverness. After the commencement of the larger works in Scotland he removed to London, and devoted his attention to the various additions and branches made to the railways constructed under his own and Locke's superintendence. He joined the Institution of Civil Engineers as an associate in 1831, and became a member 22 Jan. 1839; he was a member of the council in 1850, and a vice-president 1861–2, and bequeathed 1,000*l.* to the institution. During his career he was engaged in various parliamentary contests, when the conscientious and clear manner in which he gave his evidence had always great weight with the committees. He endeavoured to make railways commercially successful, and at the same time to combine elegance with strength and economy of design. His bridges on the Lancaster and Carlisle and the Caledonian railways, and those across the Thames at Richmond, Kew, and Kingston, show his success. Latterly he was appointed engineer to the London and South-Western Railway Company, and his plan for the line from Yeovil to Exeter was accepted in 1856. The works were immediately commenced, and after great difficulties, owing to the heavy tunnels at Crewkerne and Honiton, the line was opened in 1860. Several branches of this line were also constructed under his direction. After the completion of this work his health failed, and he died at his residence, 6 Pall Mall East, London, 4 July 1862, aged 55, and was buried in Kensal Green cemetery, in close proximity to his friend and associate, Locke.

[Minutes of Proceedings of Institute of Civil Engineers, xxii. 626–9 (1863); Times, 7 July 1862, p. 6.] G. C. B.

ERRINGTON, WILLIAM (1716–1768), catholic divine, born 17 July 1716, was son of Mark Errington, gentleman, of Wiltshire, and his wife Martha (Baker). He was sent to the English college, Douay, in or about 1737, and after his ordination remained in the college for some time as a professor. He then came on the English mission and resided for many years in London with Bishop Challoner [q. v.] At the bishop's request he attempted about 1760 to establish a middle-class boys' school, first in Buckinghamshire and then in Wales, but no record of either of these academies has been preserved. In January 1762 he removed for another trial to Betley, near Newcastle-under-Lyme, Staffordshire. Of this school no particulars are known except that he appointed the Rev. John Hurst as the master. Soon afterwards Errington secured a more suitable place for the establishment, and in March 1763 the scholars, twelve in number, were removed to Sedgley Park in the same county. This was the humble beginning of an academy which flourished on the same spot for more than a century, and which became the place of education for many of the catholic clergy, for thousands of catholics in the middle ranks, and for not a few in the higher grades of the laity. The house, usually called in the neighbourhood the Park Hall, was the residence of John, lord Ward, who removed from it soon after he was created Viscount Dudley and Ward in 1763. Lord Ward was assailed in parliament because he had let his house for a 'popish school,' but he ably vindicated his conduct. Errington appears to have been chiefly engaged in the general arrangements of the house, and soon after the appointment of the Rev. Hugh Kendall as first president of the school in May 1763, he returned to the mission in London, where he became archdeacon of the chapter and also its treasurer. After his death, which occurred in London on 28 Sept. 1768, his legal representatives being unwilling to take charge of the establishment at Sedgley Park, of which he was the founder and proprietor, solicited Bishop Hornyold, vicar-apostolic of the midland district, to undertake its management. That prelate complied with their request, and

the school flourished greatly under his superintendence.

[Husenbeth's Hist. of Sedgley Park, pp. 9–17; Barnard's Life of Challoner, p. 139; Kirk's Biogr. Collections, manuscript quoted in Gillow's Bibl. Dict.] T. C.

ERROL, eighth EARL OF (*d.* 1631). [See HAY, FRANCIS.]

ERSKINE, CHARLES (1680–1763), lord justice clerk, was the third son of Sir Charles Erskine or Areskine of Alva, bart., by his wife, Christian, daughter of Sir James Dundas of Arniston, and great-grandson of John Erskine, earl of Mar, treasurer of Scotland. He was born in 1680, and is said to have been at first educated for the church. On 26 Nov. 1700 he was appointed one of the four regents of the university of Edinburgh, whose duties were to teach a quadriennial course of logic, ethics, metaphysics, and natural philosophy. He resigned this office on 17 Oct. 1707, and on 7 Nov. following, in spite of the protest of the town council, became the first professor of public law in the university. Erskine was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates on 14 July 1711, and in 1714 was appointed advocate-depute for the western circuit. He purchased the estate of Tinwald in Dumfriesshire, and at the general election in April 1722 was returned as the member for that county. On 29 May 1725 Erskine was appointed solicitor-general for Scotland, and was at the same time by sign-manual granted the privilege, which had hitherto belonged to the lord advocate alone, of pleading within the bar. The grant of this privilege was strongly objected to by Sir Hugh Dalrymple, then president of the court, as being contrary to act of parliament, but the same privilege has nearly always been enjoyed by the holder of the office of solicitor-general from that date (*Cal. of State Papers*, Home Office, 1760–5, pp. 55–6). Erskine was re-elected for the county of Dumfries at the general election in 1727, and again in 1734, when he was also returned for the Dumfries district of burghs. On 20 Jan. 1737 he was appointed lord advocate in the place of Duncan Forbes, who had been made lord president of the court of session. At the general election in May 1741, Erskine was elected for the Wick district of burghs; but in the following year his election was declared void, and he thereupon resigned office, being succeeded by Robert Craigie of Glendoick. Erskine returned to practice at the bar, and upon the death of Sir James Mackenzie of Royston was elevated to the bench as Lord Tinwald on 23 Nov. 1744. He was appointed lord justice clerk, in the place of Andrew Fletcher of Milton, on 15 June 1748, and died at Edinburgh on 5 April 1763, aged 83. Tytler says that as a lawyer Erskine 'was esteemed an able civilian; he spoke with ease and gracefulness, and in a dialect which was purer than that of most of his contemporaries; as a judge his demeanour was grave and decorous, and accompanied with a gentleness and suavity of manners that were extremely ingratiating' (i. 55). While in the House of Commons he seems to have spoken but rarely, and his name only occurs twice in the volumes of the 'Parliamentary History' (ix. 824, x. 294–5).

Erskine married, first, on 21 Dec. 1712, Grizel Grierson, heiress of Barjarg, Dumfriesshire; and secondly, on 26 Aug. 1753, Elizabeth, daughter of William Harestanes of Craigs, Kirkcudbrightshire, and widow of Dr. William Maxwell of Preston. His portrait, taken at the age of thirty-one by T. Hudson, was engraved by J. McArdell.

His younger son, by his first wife, JAMES ERSKINE, was born on 20 June 1722, and was admitted an advocate on 6 Dec. 1743. In 1748 he became sheriff depute of Perthshire, and in 1754 one of the barons of the exchequer in Scotland. He was appointed knight-marshal of Scotland on the death of John, third earl of Kintore, in 1758, and three years afterwards succeeded Patrick Boyle of Shewalton as a judge of the court of session, taking his seat on the bench as Lord Barjarg 18 June 1761. He afterwards took the title of Alva in lieu of Barjarg, and died on 13 May 1796, in the seventy-third year of his age. He married twice, first, on 19 June 1749, Margaret, daughter and coheiress of Hugh Macguire of Drumdow, Ayrshire, who died in April 1766; and secondly, Jean, only daughter of John Stirling of Herbertshire, and widow of Sir James Stirling, bart.

[Brunton and Haig's Senators of the College of Justice (1832), pp. 513–14, 526; Omond's Lord Advocates of Scotland (1883), ii. 1–3; Tytler's Memoirs of Lord Kames (1814), i. 53–5; Scots Mag. 1763, xxv. 180, 1796, lviii. 362; Bromley's Catalogue of Engraved British Portraits (1793), p. 374; Foster's Peerage (1883), pp. 605–6; Official Return of Lists of Members of Parliament, pt. ii. pp. 60, 70, 83, 84, 97.] G. F. R. B.

ERSKINE, DAVID, second LORD CARDROSS (1616–1671), royalist, was the only son of Henry Erskine, second son of the second marriage of John Erskine, earl of Mar, and heir to the barony of Cardross, by his wife Margaret, only daughter of Sir James Bellenden of Broughton, near Edinburgh. On the death of his grandfather in December 1634 he became vested in the title of Cardross, and was served heir to his father in

the barony, 17 March 1636-7. He was one of the few peers who protested against the delivering up of Charles I to the English army at Newcastle in 1646, and was a promoter of the 'engagement' in 1648, for which he was fined 1,000*l.*, and debarred from sitting in parliament in 1649. He died in 1671. He was twice married: first, in 1645, to Anne, fifth daughter of Sir Thomas Hope, bart., of Craighall, Edinburghshire, by whom he had Henry, third lord Cardross [q. v.]; and secondly, in 1655, to Mary, youngest daughter of Sir George Bruce of Carnock, Fifeshire.

[Douglas's Peerage of Scotland (Wood), i. 273; Addit. MS. 23114, ff. 42, 59, 62, 81.] G. G.

ERSKINE, DAVID, Lord Dun (1670–1758), Scotch judge, son of David Erskine of Dun, near Montrose, Forfarshire, was born in 1670, and studied at the universities of St. Andrews and of Paris. He became a member of the Scottish bar on 19 Nov. 1698, and soon rose to eminence. He represented Forfarshire at the convention of estates, 1689, and in the parliaments of 1690, 1691, 1693, 1695, and 1696, and opposed the union. In November 1710 he took his seat as an ordinary lord by the title of Lord Dun, and on 13 April 1714 was also appointed a lord of justiciary. He resigned his justiciary gown in 1744 and his office as an ordinary lord in 1753, and died 26 May 1758 in the eighty-fifth year of his age (*Scots Mag.* xx. 276–7). He is author of a little volume entitled 'Lord Dun's Friendly and Familiar Advices adapted to the various Stations and Conditions of Life,' 12mo, Edinburgh, 1754. His arguments on the doctrine of passive obedience were assailed the same year by Dr. Robert Wallace, minister at Moffat, who characterises Erskine as 'a venerable old man, of very great experience, and greatly distinguished for piety.'

[Brunton and Haig's Account of the Senators of the College of Justice, p. 491; Addit. MS. 6860, f. 29.] G. G.

ERSKINE, Sir DAVID (1772–1837), dramatist and antiquary, the natural son of David Steuart Erskine, eleventh earl of Buchan [q. v.], was born in 1772. In early life he bore a captain's commission in the 31st foot, and also belonged to the York rangers. On the reduction of the 31st regiment, he was appointed a professor at the Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst. The Earl of Munster was there placed under his tuition, as were others of William IV's children, and at their request Erskine received the honour of knighthood, 11 Sept. 1830 (*Gent. Mag.* vol. ci. pt. i. p. 79). His father dying in 1829 bequeathed to him for life the whole of his unentailed estates, including Dryburgh Abbey, Berwickshire, which thenceforth became his permanent residence. Erskine, who was F.S.A. Scot., director of the Royal Academy of Edinburgh, and one of the founders of the Scots Military and Naval Academy in that city, died 22 Oct. 1837, aged 65. On 17 Nov. 1798 he married his cousin, Elizabeth, second daughter of Thomas, lord Erskine (*ib.* vol. lxviii. pt. ii. p. 993), and after her death, 2 Aug. 1800 (*ib.* vol. lxx. pt. ii. p. 804), he married secondly a Miss Ellis. He is the author of: 1. 'Airyformia; or Ghosts of great note,' 12mo, Kelso, 1825. 2. 'King James the First of Scotland; a tragedy in five acts' (and in verse), 12mo, Kelso, 1827. 3. 'Love amongst the Roses: or Guilford in Surrey; a military opera, in three acts' (and in prose), 12mo, Kelso, 1827. 4. 'King James the Second of Scotland, an historical drama, in five acts' (and in verse), 12mo, Kelso, 1828. 5. 'Mary, Queen of Scots; or Melrose in ancient times . . . an historical melo-drama' (in three acts and in prose), 12mo, Edinburgh, 1829. 6. 'Annals and Antiquities of Dryburgh, and other places on the Tweed, second edition,' 12mo, Kelso, 1836.

[Gent. Mag. new ser. viii. 652; Brit. Mus. Cat.; Erskine's Annals of Dryburgh, 2nd edit. pp. 49–50.] G. G.

ERSKINE, DAVID MONTAGU, second Lord Erskine (1776–1855), diplomatist, eldest son of Thomas, first lord Erskine [q. v.], the great orator, by Frances, daughter of Daniel Moore, M.P., was born, before his father was called to the bar, in 1776. He was educated at Westminster School and at Christ Church, Oxford, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1802. He did not, however, try to follow his father's profession, but was elected M.P. for Portsmouth on 19 Feb. 1806 in his place, when he was made lord chancellor, and then obtained the appointment of minister plenipotentiary to the United States of America in July 1806. He was well fitted for the duties of this post, as he had married in 1799 the daughter of General John Cadwallader of Philadelphia, the companion of Washington and one of the leaders of the American revolution. He returned to England in 1809, and succeeded his father as second Lord Erskine in November 1823, and he remained unemployed until 1825, when he was appointed minister plenipotentiary at Stuttgard, from which place he was promoted to the legation at Munich in February 1828. He remained at Munich for more than fifteen years, during which he had no opportunity of distinguishing himself, and retired on

a pension in November 1843. Erskine then returned to England, and settled at Butler's Green in Sussex, where he died on 19 March 1855. He married three times, and left by his first wife a family of five sons [see ERSKINE, EDWARD MORRIS] and seven daughters.

[Gent. Mag. May 1855.] H. M. S.

ERSKINE, DAVID STEUART, eleventh EARL OF BUCHAN (1742–1829), eldest son of Henry David, tenth earl, by his wife Agnes, daughter of Sir James Steuart, bart., of Coltness, was born 1 June 1742 (O.S.) He was a brother of the Hon. Henry Erskine [q. v.] and Thomas, lord Erskine [q. v.] During his father's life his title was Lord Cardross. He received his early education partly from his mother, who had studied mathematics under Colin Maclaurin, and partly from a private tutor, after which he entered the university of Glasgow. There he found leisure to study the arts of designing, etching, and engraving in the academy of Robert Foulis. An etching by him of the abbey of Icolmkill was prefixed to his account of that abbey in vol. i. of the 'Transactions of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.' After his university studies were completed his father endeavoured without success to obtain for him a commission in the guards, and he ultimately joined the 32nd Cornwall regiment of foot, with which he served for a few years. Through the interest of Lord Chatham he was in 1766 appointed secretary to the embassy to Spain, but, it is said, declined to proceed to Madrid on the ground that the ambassador, Sir James Gray, was a person of inferior rank to him. 'Sir,' said Johnson, 'had he gone secretary while his inferior was ambassador, he would have been a traitor to his rank and family.' According to another account he was prevented going to Spain by the illness of his father, who died shortly afterwards in 1767. The family were then staying at Walcot, near Bath, and the old earl, some time before his death, had joined the sect of the methodists patronised by the Countess of Huntingdon. The countess and her friends now exerted their influence to render the young earl 'valiant for the truth,' and with such success that 'he had the courage to make public profession of his opinions, which drew upon him the laugh and lash of all the wits and witlings of the rooms.' The countess and his mother also nominated three eminent ministers of the connexion as his chaplains, but it would appear that his methodist zeal did not long survive the change to Scotland. His special interest lay in the study of the history and antiquities of his native country, and there was always a substratum of sincerity underlying his eccentric vanity. At first, however, much of his attention was devoted to the improvement of his estates, which were much embarrassed. To encourage his tenants to introduce improvements he gave them leases of nineteen and thirty-eight years, an arrangement which has been intimately associated with the progress of agriculture in Scotland. Notwithstanding his expenditure of considerable sums on several eccentric projects, he accumulated immense wealth.

Shortly after succeeding his father, Buchan set himself to reform the method of electing Scotch representative peers. At the election of April 1768 he protested against the custom which had sprung up of lists being sent down by the government of the peers who they suggested should be elected; and by systematically protesting year after year he at last succeeded in abolishing the custom. On this subject he published in 1780 'Speech intended to be spoken at the Meeting of the Peers for Scotland for the General Election of their Representatives; in which a plan is proposed for the better Representation of the Peerage of Scotland.' In 1780 he succeeded in originating the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, the establishment of which was finally determined on at a meeting held at his house, 27 St. Andrew Square, Edinburgh, on 14 Nov. of this year. The original plan of the society included a department concerned with the natural productions of the country, and also a pretentious scheme of the earl's for a 'Caledonian Temple of Fame,' which, through an elaborate system of balloting, in some cases extending over a series of years, should enshrine the names of illustrious Scotsmen living or dead. The comprehensive plans of the earl in its institution caused some alarm to the principal and professors of the university, and the curators of the Advocates' Library, who united in opposing the petition for a royal charter of incorporation, which was nevertheless granted, probably through the earl's influence with George III. To the first volume of the 'Transactions' of the society, published in 1792, he contributed 'Memoirs of the Life of Sir James Steuart Denham, Bart.' (pp. 129–39), and 'Account of the Parish of Uphall' (pp. 139–55).

In 1786 the earl purchased the estate of Dryburgh, whither he retired in 1787, and where he chiefly spent the remainder of his life. On the important occasion he wrote a pompous circular Latin epistle to his learned friends, which was sent for publication to the 'Gentleman's Magazine' (vol. lvii. pt. i. pp. 193–4). He communicated an account of the old

abbey of Dryburgh to Grose's 'Antiquities' (i. 101–9). In 1791 he instituted an annual festival in commemoration of James Thomson, at his birthplace, Ednam, Roxburghshire, and on his grounds at Dryburgh erected an Ionic temple, with a statue of Apollo in the inside, and a bust of the poet surmounting the dome. On the occasion he placed the first edition of the 'Seasons' on the bust, and crowned it with a wreath of bays, delivering at the same time a eulogy on the poet (see detailed account of the proceedings with the earl's address in *Gent. Mag.* vol. lxi. pt. ii. pp. 1019–20, 1083–5). He sent an invitation to Burns to be present on the occasion, who declined, but sent an ode on Thomson. After the death of Burns in 1796, the earl placed in his memory an urn of Parian marble beside the bust of Thomson. Another bombastic exploit of the earl was to erect on the summit of a hill on his estate a colossal statue of Sir William Wallace, which was placed on its pedestal 22 Sept. 1814, the anniversary of the victory at Stirling Bridge in 1297. A more useful structure was a wire suspension bridge over the Tweed near the abbey, constructed in 1817, but blown down in 1850.

Buchan was a frequent contributor to the 'Gentleman's Magazine,' the 'Bee,' and other publications, his usual signature when his contributions were anonymous being 'Albanicus.' He published separately: 1. 'An Account of the Life, Writings, and Inventions of Napier of Merchiston,' written in conjunction with Dr. Walter Minto, 1787. 2. 'Essays on the Lives of Fletcher of Saltoun and the Poet Thomson, Biographical, Critical, and Political, with some pieces of Thomson never before published,' 1729. 3. 'Anonymous and Fugitive Essays collected from various Periodical Works,' vol. i. 1812. Along with Pinkerton he projected the 'Iconographia Scotica,' 1798. His relation to art, letters, and antiquities was, however, in great part that of a fussy and intermeddling patron. On matters of art he kept up an indefatigable correspondence with Horace Walpole, who 'tried everything but being rude to break off the intercourse' (*Letters*, viii. 302). Burns addressed him in terms of elaborate respect, suggestive of ironical intention, and sent him a copy of 'Scots wha hae.' On antiquarian subjects Buchan corresponded frequently with Nichols. In 1784 he sent two letters to Nichols containing 'Some Remarks on the Progress of the Roman Arms in Scotland during the Sixth Campaign of Africanus,' which were published in 1786 in vol. xxxv. of the 'Topographia Britannica.' Among the correspondents who perhaps relished their intercourse with him most were the members of the royal family. In certain conjunctures of affairs he was accustomed to send the king a letter of advice or of approval as seemed most fitting in the special circumstances, grounding his right to do so on 'my consanguinity to your majesty,' a claim of relationship with which, as laying emphasis on his descent from the Stuarts, the king seems to have been sincerely flattered (see letters to various members of the royal family in Ferguson's *Henry Erskine and his Times*, pp. 493–501). It was one of Buchan's foibles to claim the nearest kinship with persons of distinction to whom he was in the remotest degree related. Thomas Browne, author of the 'Religio Medici,' a remote progenitor, he deemed worthy to be named his grandfather, and he 'gloried' in the 'illustrious and excellent Washington' as his 'cousin' and 'friend.' On the latter account he was in the habit of showing special attention to the distinguished Americans who visited this country, and in 1792 he sent to Washington, then president of the United States, an elegantly mounted snuff-box made from the tree which sheltered Wallace. Colonel Ferguson, in a note to 'Henry Erskine and his Times,' states that for many years the earl had interested himself in the establishment of what he called his 'Commercium Epistolicum Literarium,' or depôt of correspondence. The number of letters included in this collection was 1,635. They were sent to the Advocates' Library in the hope that they would be purchased, but this was declined, and they were bought by David Laing, who sold a portion of them to Mr. Upcott, the London collector. Those formerly in possession of David Laing are now in the Laing Collection, University Library, Edinburgh (No. 364 in List of Manuscript Books of David Laing, and No. 588 of Addenda). Two volumes have been recovered by the Erskine family, and there are also a few of the letters in the library of the British Museum.

Buchan, through Lady Scott, prevailed on Sir Walter to accept as a burial-place the sepulchral aisle of Scott's Haliburton ancestors in Dryburgh. During Scott's serious illness in 1819, Buchan endeavoured to force his way into the patient's room. He afterwards explained that he had made arrangements for Scott's funeral, which he wished to communicate to Scott himself. Buchan was to pronounce a funeral oration (*Life of Scott*, chap. xliv.) After attending the earl's funeral at Dryburgh, 25 April 1829, Scott expressed his sense of relief that he had escaped the 'patronage and fuss Lord Buchan would have bestowed on his funeral had he happened to survive him' (*ib.* chap. lxxvii.)

In 'Peter's Letters to his Kinsfolk' Lockhart thus describes the appearance of the earl: 'I do not remember to have seen a more exquisite old head, and think it is no wonder that so many portraits have been painted of him. The features are all perfect, but the greatest beauty is in the clear blue eyes, which are chased in his head in a way that might teach something to the best sculptor in the world. Neither is there any want of expression in these fine features, although indeed they are very far from conveying the same ideas of power and penetration which fall from the overhanging shaggy eyebrows of his brother.' The portraits and busts taken of him were very numerous. The painting of him when Lord Cardross, by Sir Joshua Reynolds, in a Vandyck dress, is in the hall of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. It was engraved in mezzotinto by Finlayson in 1765. A profile by Tassie in 1783 was published in 1797 in 'Iconographia Scotica.' A painting by Runciman is in the museum of the Perth Antiquarian Society. To the Faculty of Advocates he presented a portrait in crayons with an inscription in highly laudatory terms written by himself. His portrait when an old man, by George Watson, president of the Royal Scottish Academy, is engraved in Ferguson's 'Henry Erskine and his Times.' The earl is the subject of a very clever caricature in highland dress by Kay. He married at Aberdeen in 1771 his cousin Margaret, eldest daughter of William Fraser of Fraserfield, Aberdeenshire, but by her, who died 12 May 1819, he had no issue. He had, however, a natural son, Sir David Erskine, who is separately noticed.

He was succeeded as twelfth earl of Buchan by his nephew, Henry David, son of his brother, the Hon. Henry Erskine [q. v.] The twelfth earl, born in July 1783, died 13 Sept. 1857. He married thrice, and David Stuart Erskine, the eldest surviving son by his first wife, Elizabeth Cole, daughter of Brigadier-general Sir Charles Shipley, succeeded him as thirteenth earl of Buchan.

[Douglas's Peerage (Wood), i. 280; Kay's Edinburgh Portraits, i. 286–9; Gent. Mag. vol. xcix. pt. ii. pp. 75–8; Nichols's Illustrations, vi. 489–521 and passim; ib. Literary Anecdotes, passim; Lord Campbell's Life of Lord Erskine in Lives of the Chancellors; Works of Robert Burns; Lockhart's Life of Scott; Horace Walpole's Letters; Lord Brougham's Autobiography; Life of Archibald Constable; Ferguson's Henry Erskine and his Times, pp. 477–505 and passim.]

T. F. H.

ERSKINE, EBENEZER (1680–1754), founder of the Scottish secession church, born on 22 June (baptised 24 July) 1680 at Dryburgh, Berwickshire (HARPER, who gives the record of birth and baptism from H. Erskine's manuscript), was the fourth son of Henry Erskine (1624–1696) [q. v.], by his second wife, Margaret (*d.* 14 Jan. 1725), daughter of Hugh Halcro of Orkney. He was educated at Edinburgh University, where he graduated M.A. (as 'Ebenezer Areskine') on 28 June 1697. After graduation he became chaplain and tutor in the family of John, earl of Rothes, at Leslie House, Fife. Having been licensed by Kirkcaldy presbytery on 11 Feb. 1703, he was called to Portmoak, Kinross-shire, on 26 May, and ordained there on 22 Sept. by the same presbytery. In the following year he married. Always diligent in the duties of his office, he was without distinct evangelical convictions, until the chance overhearing of a religious conversation between his wife and his brother Ralph [q. v.] left an indelible impression on his mind. His popularity dates from the impulse thus given to his preaching, which was homely in style (he wrote, but did not read, his sermons), yet dignified by a rich voice and a majestic manner. To his sermons and communions the people flocked from all parts, and his elders had to provide for over two thousand communicants. The attitude which he now began to take in ecclesiastical politics did not commend him to the leaders of the church. On 17 Jan. 1712 the parish of Burntisland, Fife, was divided about the election of a minister, and competing calls were made out in favour of Erskine and another; the commission of assembly gave the preference to the patron's nominee. This is said to have been the first instance of the kind since the revolution; by an act which shortly afterwards (22 May) received the royal assent the rights of patrons were fully restored. Immediately before the introduction of the patronage act the episcopal clergy had been protected by a toleration act (1712), which imposed the oath of abjuration on the ministers of both churches. This touched the consciences of those who, while rejecting the 'pretender,' found themselves unable to swear that he was no son of James II; moreover the oath was construed as affirming the principle that the monarch must adhere to the Anglican communion. On both these grounds Erskine refused the oath, remaining a non-abjurer to the last. The penalties of the act (fine and expulsion) were not enforced against the presbyterian clergy, and the non-abjurors were sustained by popular sentiment. On 2 March 1713 Erskine was called to Tulliallan, Perthshire, but his translation was refused by the presbyteries.

He sided with Boston in the 'Marrow con-

troversy,' which began in 1717 [see BOSTON, THOMAS, the elder, 1677–1732], and being one of the 'twelve apostles' who signed the 'representation' of 11 May 1721, he shared the rebuke passed on them by the assembly of 1722. His contumacy interfered with his advancement in the church, though it does not appear that he was anxious to leave Portmoak. He was proposed as a candidate for Kirkcaldy, Fife, but the synod on 1 Oct. 1724 prohibited his preaching on trial. In May 1725 Andrew Anderson arraigned him before the commission of assembly on the ground of certain sermons, some of which had been preached ten years before. He was called to Kinross, but on 4 April 1728 his translation was refused. Had he been a member of the assembly (1729) which confirmed the suspension of John Simson, divinity professor at Glasgow, for heretical teaching, he would have joined Boston in his protest against the inadequacy of the sentence. At length, on 28 April 1731, he was called to the third charge, or west church, of Stirling. He was admitted on 8 July, and transferred from Portmoak on 6 Sept. His entrance on this important charge was followed by his election to the moderatorship of the synod of Stirling and Perth. In his improved position he redoubled his opposition to the policy which ruled the proceedings of the assembly.

In 1732 the assembly passed an act to regulate the election to vacant churches in cases where patrons had failed to present. This act, which ignored the right of popular choice, was pushed through in a somewhat unconstitutional way, and Erskine initiated a protest against it, which the assembly refused to receive. Preaching in the following October as outgoing moderator of synod, on 'the stone rejected by the builders,' Erskine inveighed against the act as of no 'divine authority.' After three days' debate the synod, by a majority of six, passed a vote of censure on the sermon. Erskine appealed to the assembly, but only escaped the synod's solemn rebuke by retiring from the meeting, a course which he repeated in April. On 14 May 1733 the assembly sustained the action of synod, and Erskine was rebuked at the bar of the house by the moderator, John Goldie or Gowdie. Anticipating this censure Erskine, in concert with three others, had prepared a protest, which they now asked permission to read. This being denied they withdrew, leaving the paper behind them. By ill luck this paper fell into the hands of James Naismith of Dalmeny, Linlithgowshire, who, at the evening session, called the assembly's attention to its contents. At eleven o'clock at night the assembly's officer was sent to the four protestors, with a citation to the bar of the house next morning. They appeared and were handed over to a committee, in the hope of getting them to retract the protest. As they would not do this, the assembly directed them to appear in August before the standing commission, which was empowered to suspend, and in November to depose them, if they remained obdurate. On 16 Nov. 1733 a sentence equivalent to deposition was carried by the moderator's casting vote.

On the same day Erskine and his three friends (William Wilson of Perth, Alexander Moncrieff of Abernethy, and James Fisher of Kinclaven) put their names to a formal act of secession. At Gairney Bridge, near Kinross, they constituted themselves (6 Dec.) an 'associate presbytery,' with Erskine as moderator. They had the enthusiastic support of their flocks, who, at Perth and Abernethy, resisted the deputation of assembly appointed to declare the churches vacant. The spring communion at Abernethy drew a vast concourse of people from all parts of Scotland. The 'testimony' of the new religious body, issued in March, had roused the whole country. The assembly began to feel that it had gone too far. Accordingly in 1734 the obnoxious act was declared to be informal and 'no longer binding;' and on 14 May 1734 the synod was empowered to remove the censure from the four ministers, and restore them to their status. This was done on 2 July. That nothing might be wanting to the grace of the restoration, Erskine was in his absence re-elected to the moderator's chair.

Wilson would have accepted these healing measures, but Erskine had now embarked on a course from which he could not turn back. He regarded the assembly's whole ecclesiastical policy as a compromise, and was not to be won by personal concessions. The proceedings of the assemblies of 1735 and 1736 confirmed his distrust of the overtures for conciliation, and brought applications to the 'associate presbytery' for 'supply of preaching' from seceding bodies in various parishes, where the appointment of ministers under the law of patronage had been confirmed by the assembly in the face of congregational remonstrance. After the assembly of 1736 Wilson came round to Erskine's view of the situation, and on 3 Dec. 1736 the four seceding ministers issued their second or 'judicial testimony,' which reviewed the history of the church of Scotland from the Reformation, and presented an elaborate indictment of the policy pursued since 1650.

Modern successors of Erskine's movement agree that the 'judicial testimony' is a document of very unequal merit. Its historical

references are often inaccurate, while its invective against the repeal of the penal statutes against witchcraft, and its dealing with the rights of other men's consciences, detract from the nobility of its protest. In exhibiting hostility to the union with England, the testimony simply resumes the attitude of the assembly itself, which for years had treated the union as an occasion for national fasting. The issue of the testimony was followed by important adhesions to the cause of secession. In February 1737 Ralph Erskine and Thomas Mair of Orwell joined the 'associate presbytery.' Later in the year parliament passed an act in reference to the murder of Captain Porteous, and ordered that every minister of the church of Scotland should read the act from the pulpit once a month for a year on pain of deprivation. Two ministers, Thomas Nairn of Abbotshall and James Thompson of Burntisland, joined the 'associate presbytery' rather than obey the Erastian ordinance; and the reading of the act led to further secessions in many parishes. The 'associate presbytery' now began to provide for a supply of ministers by licensing candidates.

In 1738 the assembly, on a complaint from the synod of Perth, directed the standing commission to bring the eight seceders before the next assembly. They were cited individually to appear at the assembly's bar in May 1739, to answer charges of 'crimes' and 'enormities.' They met, and passed an act of 'declinature' renouncing the assembly's authority. On 18 May they appeared as a presbytery at the assembly's bar. The moderator of assembly expressed the willingness of the church to ignore what had passed if the seceders would return. Mair, as their moderator, explained that they took the position of an independent judicatory. The libel against them was read; Mair read the 'declinature' in reply, and the 'associate presbytery' withdrew. Still the assembly, which contained such men as John Willison of Brechin, in strong sympathy with the general views of the seceders, did not proceed to extreme measures. The seceders were again cited to the assembly of 1740. They disregarded the summons, and on 15 May, by a majority of 140 to 30, they were formally deposed.

Next Sunday (18 May) Erskine's congregation at Stirling found the doors of the West Church locked against them. They were about to break in, when Erskine interposed, led a vast concourse to the Abbey Craig, just outside the town, and conducted public worship. Till a meeting-house (erected 1740) was ready for him he continued to officiate in the open air.

The seceders took vigorous steps to consolidate their position. Wilson was their professor of divinity, and Ralph Erskine writes to Whitefield (10 April 1741) that he had 'moe candidates for the ministrie under his charge than most of the public colleges, except Edinburgh.' At the invitation of the seceders Whitefield visited Scotland, preaching his first sermon in the parish church of Dunfermline, from which Ralph Erskine had not yet been excluded. In August 1741 Whitefield held a conference with the 'associate presbytery.' They wanted him to preach only for them, because they were 'the Lord's people.' Whitefield characteristically replied that 'the devil's people' had more need to be preached to. A rupture ensued, and the subsequent 'revival' at Cambuslang, under Whitefield's preaching, was denounced by the seceders as a satanic delusion. When Wesley subsequently visited Scotland (1751), he considered the seceders 'more uncharitable than the papists.'

On 28 Dec. 1743, Erskine revived at Stirling the practice of public covenanting. The secession was rapidly growing; and on 11 Oct. 1744 it was organised as an 'associate synod,' containing the three presbyteries of Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Dunfermline. From the north of Ireland applications for ministerial supply had been received as early as 1736, and were repeatedly renewed by seceding minorities from presbyterian congregations. The Irish interest was placed under the care of the Glasgow presbytery; and at length, on 9 July 1746, Isaac Patton was ordained at Lylehill, co. Antrim, by a commission from Glasgow. Nowhere was the work of the secession more important than in Ulster, where, in spite of great opposition, it exercised a very potent influence in restoring to presbyterianism its evangelical character.

During the rebellion of 1745, Erskine and his followers mounted guard at Stirling in defence of the town. Stirling was taken, and Erskine then preached to his congregation in the wood of Tullibody, some miles to the north. In 1746 he headed two companies of seceders against the 'Pretender,' and received a special letter of thanks from the Duke of Cumberland.

But now a question of religious politics arose, which split the secession into two antagonistic parties. Already in 1741 the seceders had been at issue on the question of appointing a public fast, on the day fixed for the established church by the crown. Erskine was with the minority who would have been willing to adopt the ordinary day. At the first meeting of the 'associate synod' the terms of the civic oath taken by burgesses of Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Perth came

under review. This oath pledged the burgesses to the support of 'the true protestant religion presently professed within this realm, and authorised by the laws thereof,' in opposition to 'the Roman religion called papistry.' It was held by some that the terms of the oath implied an approval of the established church, if not an adhesion to it. The synod was torn by heated debates on this point. On 9 April 1746 a majority at a thin meeting condemned the oath as unlawful. On 9 April 1747 the synod modified its judgment; declaring by a small majority that its previous decision should not be made a term of communion, till it had been referred to the consideration of the presbyteries and kirk-sessions. The dissentient minority, nearly one-half of the synod, regarded this vote as unconstitutional, and immediately separated, taking the name of the 'general associate synod.' Popularly it was known as the 'anti-burgher synod,' and the original body as the 'burgher synod.' The 'associate synod' was left without a professor of divinity, and Erskine undertook the duties. His health compelled him to resign this work in 1749. John Brown (1722–1787) [q. v.] of Haddington, the commentator, began his theological studies with him.

Feeling ran so high between the two sections of the secession, that on 4 Aug. 1748, the 'anti-burgher synod' passed sentence of deposition from the ministry on Erskine and ten other ministers of the 'burgher synod.' The breach was not healed till 8 Sept. 1820, when the two synods joined in forming the 'united associate synod,' from which few congregations stood aloof. The Irish seceders were incorporated into the Irish general assembly on 10 July 1840 [see COOKE, HENRY, D.D.] The Scottish seceders amalgamated with the 'synod of relief' [see BOSTON, THOMAS, the younger] on 13 May 1847, thus forming the 'united presbyterian church.'

Erskine died on 2 June 1754. He was twice married: first, on 2 Feb. 1704, to Alison (*d.* 1720), daughter of Alexander Turpie, writer at Leven, Fifeshire; by her he had ten children, of whom two sons and four daughters reached maturity; Jean, his eldest daughter, married the above-mentioned James Fisher, minister of Kinclaven, Perthshire; secondly, in 1723, to Mary (*d.* 1751), daughter of James Webster, minister at Edinburgh; by her he had two sons, James and Alexander, a daughter, Mary, and two other daughters. A statue of Erskine is placed in the United Presbyterian Synod Hall, Queen Street, Edinburgh.

Erskine's 'Works' were published in 1799, 8vo, 3 vols., and again in 1826, 8vo, 2 vols. They consist almost entirely of sermons, which he began to publish in 1725, with a few controversial pamphlets. The chief collection of his sermons published in his lifetime was: 1. 'The Sovereignty of Zion's King,' Edinburgh, 1739, 12mo. Posthumous were: 2. 'Sermons, mostly preached upon Sacramental Occasions,' Edinburgh, 1755, 8vo. 3. 'Discourses,' Edinburgh, 1757, 8vo, 3 vols. 4. 'Sermons and Discourses,' Glasgow, 1762, 8vo, 4 vols.; Edinburgh, 1765, 8vo, a fifth volume (this edition was brought out by the Duchess of Northumberland, in whose family one of Erskine's sons lived as a gardener). He assisted his brother Ralph in drawing up the synod's catechism. Among his manuscripts were six volumes on 'catechetical doctrine,' written at Portmoak between 1717 and 1723; several volumes of expository discourses; and forty-six sermon note-books, each containing about thirty-six sermons of an hour's length. Reprints of his single sermons, in rude chapbook style, are among the most curious productions of the early provincial presses of Ulster, at Newry, Lurgan, Omagh, &c.

[Hew Scott's Fasti Eccles. Scot.; contemporary pamphlets, especially the Representations of Masters E. Erskine and J. Fisher, &c., 1733; A Review of the Narrative, &c., 1734; the Vision of the two brothers, Ebenezer and Ralph, &c., 1737; the Re-Exhibition of the Testimony, 1779 (contains a revised reprint of most of the original documents relating to the secession); Memoir by James Fisher, in preface to Ralph Erskine's works, 1764; enlarged memoir, by D. Fraser, prefixed to Ebenezer Erskine's works, 1826; Jones's edition of Gillies's memoir of G. Whitefield, 1812, p. 273, &c.; Chalmers's Biog. Dict. 1814, xiii. 306; Thomson's Origin of the Secession Church, 1848; Cat. of Edinburgh Graduates (Bannatyne Club), 1858, p. 156; Grub's Eccles. Hist. of Scotland, 1861, iv. 54 sq.; Reid's Hist. Presb. Ch. in Ireland (Killen), 1867, iii. 241 sq.; Harper's Life of Erskine, quoted in Anderson's Scottish Nation, 1870, ii. 150.]

A. G.

ERSKINE, EDWARD MORRIS (1817–1883), diplomatist, fourth son of David Montagu, second lord Erskine [q. v.], by Frances, daughter of General John Cadwallader of Philadelphia, was born on 17 March 1817. He entered the diplomatic service as attaché to his father at Munich, and after filling various subordinate posts was appointed secretary of legation at Florence in 1852. He was transferred to Washington, and thence to Stockholm in 1858, was promoted secretary of embassy to St. Petersburg in 1860, and in the same year to Constantinople, and in 1864 was appointed minister plenipoten-

tiary to Greece. During his stay there nothing of importance happened until the murder of Mr. Vyner, Mr. Herbert, and Mr. Lloyd, three English tourists, by Greek brigands, who had seized them on the plains of Marathon in 1870. His behaviour at this time was severely blamed by some English newspapers; he was said not to have exerted sufficient vigour, and to have unwisely rejected the overtures made by the brigands. Nevertheless the government approved of his action, for he was promoted to the legation at Stockholm in 1872, and made a C.B. in 1873. He remained at Stockholm until 1881, when he retired on a pension, and he died at Neville House, Twickenham, on 19 April 1883.

[Foreign Office List, and the newspapers of February, March, and April 1870, on the murders in Greece.] H. M. S.

ERSKINE, HENRY, third Lord Cardross (1650–1693), covenanter, eldest son of David, second lord Cardross [q.v.], by his first wife, Anne, fifth daughter of Sir Thomas Hope, king's advocate, was born in 1650. The title was originally conferred on the first Earl of Mar, and, in accordance with the right with which he was invested of conferring it on any of his heirs male, it was granted by him to his second son Henry, along with the barony of Cardross. By his father young Erskine had been educated in the principles of the covenanters, and at an early period distinguished himself by his opposition to the administration of Lauderdale. In this he was strongly supported by his wife, Catherine, youngest of the two daughters and coheiresses of Sir William Stewart of Kirkhill. On account of his wife's determination to have a presbyterian chaplain to perform worship in her own house he was fined 4,000*l.*, of which he paid 1,000*l.*, and after an attempt to obtain a remission for the balance he was, 5 Aug. 1675, committed to the prison of Edinburgh, where he remained four years. In May of the same year, when, during his absence in Edinburgh, conventicles were being held near Cardross, a party of guards in search of a covenanter named John King entered his house at midnight, broke into his chests, and after acting with great rudeness towards his wife placed a guard in it (Wodrow, *Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, 288). Their complaints that the conventicles then being held had his encouragement were the chief causes why his fine was not relaxed. On 7 Aug. 1677, while still in prison, he was fined in one half of his rent for permitting his two children to be christened by unlicensed ministers (Fountainhall, *Historical Notices*, 174; Wodrow, 359). In 1679 the king's forces in their march westwards went two miles out of their way to quarter on his estates of Kirkhill and Uphall, West Lothian. He obtained his release from prison, 30 July of this year, on giving bond for the amount of his fine, and early next year went to London, where he laid before the king a narrative of the sufferings to which he had been exposed. This proceeding gave great offence to the Scottish privy council, who sent a letter to the king accusing Cardross of misrepresentation, the result being that all redress was denied him. Thereupon he emigrated to North America, where he established a plantation at Charlestown Neck, South Carolina. On 28 Oct. 1685 his estate in Scotland was exposed to sale by public roup, and was bought by the Earl of Mar at seventeen years' purchase (Fountainhall, *Historical Notices*, 671). Cardross, having been driven from the settlement in Carolina by the Spaniards, went to Holland, and in 1688 he accompanied the Prince of Orange to England. In the following year he raised a regiment of dragoons, with which he served under General Mackay against Dundee. An act was passed restoring him to his estates, and he was also sworn a privy councillor and constituted general of the mint. In July 1689 the Duke of Hamilton, the king's commissioner, at a meeting of the council, fell 'with great violence' on Lord Cardross, asserting that it was by his dragoons that the episcopal minister of Logie had been prevented entering his church; but Cardross denied all knowledge of anything asserted to have happened (Earl of Crawford to Lord Melville, 27 July 1689, in *Leven and Melville Papers*, 200). Cardross was engaged in the battle of Killiecrankie, of which he sent an account to Lord Melville in a letter of 30 July (*ib.* 209; Mackay's *Memoirs*, 258). When the Duke of Hamilton proposed a new oath to the council, Cardross objected to it as contrary to the instrument of government, and also 'because the maner of swering by the Bible is nether the Scotish nor the Presbiterian forme, and seems to raise the Bible as more than God' (*Leven and Melville Papers*, 348). In the instructions sent by King William on 18 Dec. 1689 to 'model three troops of dragoons,' Cardross was proposed as lieutenant-colonel and captain of the first troop (Mackay's *Memoirs*, 309). In 1690 he was appointed one of a commission to examine into the condition of the universities (*Leven and Melville Papers*, 563). In October 1691 he went to London along with the Earl of Crawford to support the proceedings of the Scotch council against the episcopalians (Luttrell, *Relation*, ii. 292). He died at

Edinburgh on 21 May 1693. He had four sons and three daughters. His eldest son, David, fourth lord Cardross, succeeded to the earldom of Buchan in 1695.

[Wodrow's Sufferings of the Church of Scotland; Fountainhall's Historical Notices; Lauderdale Papers; Leven and Melville Papers; Mackay's Memoirs; Luttrell's Relation; Douglas's Scotch Peerage (Wood), i. 275–6.] T. F. H.

ERSKINE, HENRY (1624–1696), covenanting minister, was born in 1624 at Dryburgh, in the parish of Mertoun, Berwickshire, being one of the younger sons of Ralph Erskine of Shielfield, a cadet of the family of the Earl of Mar. It is commonly said that his father's family were thirty-three in number; but the late Principal Harper says he had seen a small manuscript volume in which Ralph Erskine had entered the names of all his children, just twelve in number (see *United Presbyterian Fathers—Life of Ebenezer Erskine*). Mr. Simpson, minister of Dryburgh, under whose ministry he was brought up, was a man of very earnest piety, and probably influenced him to study for the ministry. His first charge was at Cornhill, a village in Northumberland, where, according to Wodrow, he was ordained in 1649, but according to others ten years later. From this charge he was ejected by the Act of Uniformity on St. Bartholomew's day, 1662, greatly to the regret of his people. The revenues of his charge not having been paid to him, he went to London to petition the king to order payment; but after long delay he was told that unless he would conform he should have nothing. Driven on his voyage home by a storm into Harwich, he preached with such acceptance and benefit that the people would have had him to take up his abode with them; but his wife could not be prevailed on to settle so far from her friends and home.

On leaving Cornhill he took up his abode at Dryburgh, where he lived in a house of his brother's. From time to time he exercised his ministry in a quiet way, till arousing the suspicion of Urquhart of Meldrum, one of those soldiers who scoured the country to put down conventicles, he was summoned to appear before a committee of privy council. Being asked by Sir George Mackenzie, lord advocate, whether he would engage to preach no more in conventicles, he boldly replied, 'My lord, I have my commission from Christ, and though I were within an hour of my death I durst not lay it down at the feet of any mortal man.' He was ordered to pay a fine of five thousand merks, and to be imprisoned on the Bass Rock till he should pay the fine and promise to preach no more. Being in very poor health he petitioned that the sentence might be changed to banishment from the kingdom. This was allowed, and he settled first at Parkridge, near Carlisle, and afterwards at Monilaws, near Cornhill, where his son Ralph was born. Apprehended again, he was imprisoned at Newcastle, but on his release in 1685 the king's indulgence enabled him to continue his ministry without molestation. He preached first at Whitsome, near Berwick, and after the revolution was admitted minister of Chirnside, where he died in 1696, at the age of seventy-two. During his times of persecution he and his family were often in great want, but obtained remarkable help. It is said that when he could not give his children a dinner he would give them a tune upon his zither. Thomas Boston of Ettrick [q. v.] bears grateful testimony to the profound impression made on him in his boyhood by hearing Erskine preach at Whitsome. Many other men of mark owned him as their spiritual father. He was twice married: first, in 1653, to a lady of whom little is known, and again to Margaret Halcro, a descendant of an old family in Orkney. His two distinguished sons, Ralph [q. v.] and Ebenezer [q. v.], were children of the second marriage.

[Scott's Fasti; Calamy's Continuation; Palmer's Nonconf. Memorial; Wodrow's History; Fraser's Life and Diary of Ebenezer Erskine, with memoir of Rev. Henry Erskine.] W. G. B.

ERSKINE, Sir HENRY or HARRY (*d.* 1765), fifth baronet of Alva and Cambuskenneth in Clackmannanshire, lieutenant-general, was second son of Sir John, the third baronet, who was accidentally killed in 1739, and his wife, the Hon. Catherine, second daughter of Lord Sinclair. His name first appears in the books at the war office on his appointment to a company in the 1st Royal Scots, 12 March 1743. The probable explanation is that his previous service was passed in the same regiment, which was very many years on the Irish establishment. Horace Walpole alludes to his having served under General Anstruther in Minorca (*Letters*, ii. 242). Erskine served as deputy quartermaster-general, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, in the blundering expedition to L'Orient in 1746, under command of his uncle, Lieutenant-general Hon. James St. Clair, where he was wounded. He afterwards served with the 1st Royal Scots in Flanders, where his elder brother, Sir Charles, fourth baronet, a major in the same regiment, was killed at the battle of Val (otherwise Laffeldt or Kisselt), 2 July 1747. Erskine was returned in parliament for Ayr in 1749, and represented

Anstruther from 1754 to 1761. His name was removed from the army list in 1756, owing, it is said, to his opposition to the employment of the Hanoverian and Hessian troops; but he was afterwards restored and rose to the rank of lieutenant-general. He was colonel in succession of the 67th foot, the 25th foot, then the Edinburgh regiment, and the 1st Royal Scots, in which latter appointment he succeeded his uncle, the Hon. James St. Clair, *de jure* Lord Sinclair, who died in 1762, without taking up the title. Erskine was secretary of the order of the Thistle. He married in 1761 Janet, daughter of Peter Wedderburn of Chesterhall, and sister of Alexander Wedderburn, afterwards lord chancellor of England, and first Earl of Rosslyn, by whom he left two sons and one daughter, the eldest of whom succeeded his maternal uncle as second Earl of Rosslyn [see ERSKINE, JAMES ST. CLAIR, second EARL OF ROSSLYN]. Erskine died at York, when returning from the north to his residence at Kew, 9 Aug. 1765.

Erskine was an accomplished man, and for some time a fashionable figure in political circles in London. Horace Walpole sneers at him as a military poet and a creature of Lord Bute's (*Letters*, ii. 242). Philip Thicknesse (NICHOLS, *Lit. Anecd.* ix.) has left an account of a transaction in which Erskine, on behalf of Lord Bute, endeavoured to prevent the publication of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's letters, entitled 'An Account of what passed between Sir Harry Erskine and Philip Thicknesse, Esq. . . .' (London, 1766, 8vo). A letter from Lord Bute to Erskine, dated 8 April 1763, respecting Lord George Sackville, stating that the king admitted and condemned the harsh treatment of the latter, but was prevented by state reasons from affording him the redress intended, is printed at length in 'Hist. MSS. Comm.,' 9th Rep. 111,116. Erskine is always credited with the authorship of the fine old Scottish march, 'Garb of Old Gaul,' but Major-general D. Stewart of Garth, a regimental authority, states that the words were originally composed in Gaelic by a soldier of the 42nd highlanders, and were set to music by Major Reid of the same regiment, afterwards the veteran General John Reid, and that several officers claimed to be the English adapters.

[Foster and Burke's Peerages, under 'Rosslyn;' War Office Records; Army Lists; Beatson's Nav. and Mil. Memoirs (1794), vol. ii., for account of L'Orient expedition; H. Walpole's Letters; Brit. Mus. Cats. Printed Books, Music; Major-general D. Stewart's Sketches of the Scottish Highlanders (Edinburgh, 1822), i. 347; Scots Mag. 1765, p. 391.] H. M. C.

ERSKINE, HENRY (1746–1817), lord advocate, second son of Henry, tenth earl of Buchan, by his wife, Agnes, second daughter of Sir James Steuart of Goodtrees, bart., was born in Gray's Close, Edinburgh, on 1 Nov. 1746. After receiving some instruction in Latin at Richard Dick's school at St. Andrews, he matriculated as a student of the united college of St. Salvator and St. Leonard on 20 Feb. 1760. In 1763 he proceeded to Glasgow University, and subsequently went to Edinburgh University, where in 1766 he attended the classes of Professors Wallace, Hugh Blair, and Adam Ferguson. While studying for the bar Erskine became a member of the Forum Debating Society in Edinburgh, where he 'acquired the power of extempore speaking which was the foundation of his future success as a pleader.' At this time he also wrote several poetical pieces of considerable merit, one of which, entitled 'The Nettle and the Sensitive Plant,' has been printed. He was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates on 20 Feb. 1768. His first triumphs as a pleader were obtained in the debates of the general assembly of the church of Scotland, of which at an early age he had been elected an elder. When he had been called to the bar a little more than ten years, he was proposed as a candidate for the procuratorship. Erskine, who had identified himself with the 'Highflyer' or evangelical section, was, however, defeated by William (afterwards Lord) Robertson, the representative of the 'Moderate' or tory party. In August 1783 he was appointed lord advocate in the coalition ministry, in the place of Henry Dundas, afterwards Lord Melville. It is related that on the morning of his appointment he met Dundas, who had already resumed his stuff gown. After chatting with him for a short time Erskine gaily observed, 'I must leave off talking to go and order my silk gown' (the official costume of the lord advocate). 'It is hardly worth while,' replied Dundas dryly, 'for the time you will want it; you had better borrow mine.' Upon this Erskine, who was never at loss for a reply, wittily observed, 'From the readiness with which you make the offer, Mr. Dundas, I have no doubt that the gown is a gown made to fit any party; but, however short my time in office may be, it shall never be said of Henry Erskine that he put on the abandoned habits of his predecessor.' Before Erskine could obtain a seat in the House of Commons Fox's East India Bill was thrown out in the lords. The coalition ministry was thereupon summarily dismissed by the king in December 1733, and Erskine was succeeded by Sir Ilay Campbell [q. v.], afterwards lord presi-

dent of the court of session. Somewhat earlier in this year Erskine had been appointed advocate, and state councillor to the Prince of Wales in Scotland. In the debate in the House of Commons on 14 Jan. 1784, concerning the charges of bribery made against the former ministry, Dundas thus vindicated the political integrity of the late lord advocate: 'He said he [Erskine] was incapable of being prostituted into the character of a distributor of the wages of corruption, and he was convinced that such description of him had originated in misinformation' (*Parl. Hist.* xxiv. 341). In December 1785 Dundas resigned the post of dean of the Faculty of Advocates, and at the anniversary meeting on the 24th of that month Erskine was elected in his place by a decided majority, in spite of the influence of the government, which was exerted against him. In 1795 Erskine, who, though he had always been in favour of reform, had hitherto endeavoured to restrain the zeal of the more revolutionary reformers, became greatly alarmed at the introduction of the 'sedition' and 'treason' bills; and at a public meeting held in Edinburgh on 28 Nov. 1795 he moved a series of resolutions which, while expressing horror at the late outrages on the king, condemned the bills as striking 'at the very existence of the British constitution.' Erskine had been annually re-elected dean of the faculty since 1785, but in consequence of the prominent part which he had taken at this meeting it was determined by the ministerial party to oppose his re-election, and at the anniversary meeting on 12 Jan. 1796 Robert Dundas of Arniston, then lord advocate, was chosen dean by a majority of eighty-five, only thirty-eight members voting for Erskine. Lord Cockburn, in commenting on this unjustifiable proceeding, says: 'This dismissal was perfectly natural at a time when all intemperance was natural. But it was the Faculty of Advocates alone that suffered. Erskine had long honoured his brethren by his character and reputation, and certainly he lost nothing by being removed from the official chair' (*Life of Lord Jeffrey*, 1852, i. 94). For many years afterwards 'The Independence of the Bar and Henry Erskine' was a favourite toast among the whigs, and at the public dinner at Edinburgh, given to Lord Erskine on 21 Feb. 1820, the health was drunk of 'the remaining individuals of that virtuous number of thirty-eight, the small but manly band of true patriots within the bosom of the Faculty of Advocates who stood firm in the support of the Hon. Henry Erskine when he had opposed the unconstitutional and oppressive measures of the ministers of the day.'

On the death of Lord Eskgrove in October 1804 the office of lord clerk register was offered through Charles Hope to Erskine, who, however, declined it, refusing to separate his fortunes from those of his party. In the early part of 1806 the ministry of 'All the Talents' was formed, Thomas Erskine was made lord chancellor, while his elder brother Henry once more became lord advocate. At a bye election in April he was elected for the Haddington district of burghs, and took his seat in parliament for the first time. At the general election in November 1806 he was returned for the Dumfries district of burghs, but the downfall of the ministry in March 1807 deprived him of office, and the dissolution in the following month put an end to his parliamentary career. Though Lord Campbell's statement that Erskine 'never opened his mouth in the House of Commons, so that the oft debated question how he was qualified to succeed there remained unsolved' (*Lives of the Lord Chancellors* (1847), vi. 705), is clearly erroneous, it does not appear that he took any conspicuous part in the debates (*Parl. Debates*, vi–ix.) This was probably owing to the fact that the only important Scottish question which came before parliament at that time was the bill 'for the better regulation of the courts of justice in Scotland,' which was introduced into the lords by Lord Grenville and never reached the House of Commons. Erskine was succeeded as lord advocate by Archibald Campbell-Colquhoun [q. v.], with whom he engaged in a sharp controversy on the respective merits of Lord Grenville's and Lord Eldon's bills for the reform of legal procedure (*Scots Mag.* for 1808, pp. 70–2, 149–52). On 2 Nov. 1808 he was appointed on the commission to inquire into the administration of justice in Scotland (*Parl. Papers*, 1809, vol. iv.) Upon the death of Robert Blair [q. v.] in May 1811 it was expected that Erskine would have been appointed president of the court of session, but Charles Hope, the lord justice clerk, who was some fifteen years junior at the bar to Erskine, eventually received the appointment. Though Erskine's mind was still clear and active, his health had already begun to fail him. Being deprived of preferment, which was justly his due, he resolved to give up his practice at the bar, and thereupon retired to his country house of Ammondell in Linlithgowshire. Here he amused himself with his garden and his violin until his death on 8 Oct. 1817, when he was in the seventy-first year of his age. He was buried in the family vault adjoining Uphall Church. Erskine was a man of many brilliant gifts. Not only was he endowed with a handsome

presence, a fascinating manner, and a sparkling wit, but he was by far the most eloquent speaker at the Scotch bar in his time. Lord Brougham bears the following remarkable testimony to Erskine's powers of advocacy: 'If I were,' he says, 'to name the most consummate exhibition of forensic talent that I ever witnessed, whether in the skilful conduct of the argument, the felicity of the copious illustrations, the cogency of the reasoning, or the dexterous appeal to the prejudices of the court, I should without hesitation at once point to his address (hearing in presence) on Maitland's case; and were my friend Lauderdale alive, to him I should appeal, for he heard it with me, and came away declaring that his brother Thomas (Lord Erskine) never surpassed—nay, he thought never equalled it' (*Life and Times*, 1871, i. 231). While Lord Jeffrey, in his article in the 'Scots Magazine' (1817, new ser. i. 292), records that Erskine 'could not only make the most repulsive subjects agreeable, but the most abstruse easy and intelligible. In his profession, indeed, all his wit was argument, and each of his delightful illustrations a material step in his reasoning.' Though he possessed strong political opinions, and never swerved from his allegiance to the whig party, he was popular in all classes of society, for 'nothing,' says Lord Cockburn, 'was so sour as not to be sweetened by the glance, the voice, the gaiety, the beauty of Henry Erskine' (*Life of Lord Jeffrey*, i. 93). But perhaps there is no better testimony to his worth than the well-known story, to which reference is made in the inscription on the tablet lately affixed to his birthplace: 'No poor man wanted a friend while Harry Erskine lived.'

Erskine, on 30 March 1772, married Christian, the only child of George Fullerton of Broughton Hall, near Edinburgh, comptroller of the customs at Leith. She died on 9 May 1804, and on 7 Jan. 1805 he married, secondly, Erskine, widow of James Turnbull, advocate, and daughter of Alexander Munro of Glasgow. By his first wife Erskine had several children, one of whom, viz. Henry David Erskine, succeeded as twelfth earl of Buchan on the death of his uncle in 1829. There were no children by the second marriage. The present Earl of Buchan is Erskine's grandson. A portrait of Erskine by Sir Henry Raeburn was exhibited in the Raeburn collection at Edinburgh in 1876 (*Cat.* No. 166), and has been engraved by James Ward (see frontispiece to Fergusson's *Henry Erskine*). Several etchings of Erskine will be found in Kay (Nos. 30, 58, 187, and 320). In an 'Extempore in the Court of Session' Burns contrasts the style of his friend Erskine with that of Ilay Campbell (Kilmarnock edit. 1876, p. 274). According to Watt, Erskine published an anonymous pamphlet entitled 'Expediency of Reform in the Court of Session in Scotland,' London, 1807, 8vo. It consists, however, only of a reprint of two earlier tracts and an introduction. Erskine's 'Emigrant, an Eclogue occasioned by the late numerous Emigrations from the Highlands of Scotland. Written in 1773,' attained great popularity, and in 1793 was published as a chapbook. A copy of this poem was reprinted in 1879 for private circulation by the late Mrs. Dunmore-Napier, one of Erskine's grandchildren. Few men have enjoyed in their lifetime a wider reputation either for their oratory or their wit than Erskine, and it is much to be regretted that neither have his speeches been preserved nor a complete collection of his poems and witticisms made. Some of his verses appeared in Maria Riddell's 'Metrical Miscellany,' the first edition of which was published in 1802, and several of his pieces and many of his witticisms will be found in Fergusson. The Faculty of Advocates possesses a volume of manuscripts containing 'a Collection of Mr. Erskine's Poems, transcribed about the year 1780. They consist of "Love Elegies dedicated to Amanda," 1770; pastoral eclogues and fables; "The Emigrant," a poem (with a few corrections in the hand of the author), along with some epigrams and miscellaneous pieces, including translations and imitations of ancient classical writers, partly dated between the years 1769 and 1776.'

[Fergusson's Henry Erskine (1882); Omond's Lord Advocates of Scotland (1883), ii. 163–74; Chambers's Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen (1868), i. 547–8; Kay's Original Portraits and Caricature Etchings (1877), i. 124–8; Anderson's Scottish Nation (1865), ii. 166–71; The Georgian Era (1833), ii. 542–3; Foster's Peerage (1883), p. 102; pamphlet without title containing the resolutions moved by Erskine at the meeting in Edinburgh on 28 Nov. 1795, and the correspondence concerning the election of the dean for 1796 (Reports, Faculty of Advocates, vol. ii., in Brit. Mus.); Notes and Queries, 3rd ser. vii. 41–2, x. 9–10, 62, 218, 4th ser. iii. 296–7, 5th ser. xi. 369, 6th ser. x. 20; Official Return of Lists of Members of Parliament, pt. ii. 226, 238.] G. F. R. B.

ERSKINE, JAMES, sixth Earl of Buchan (*d.* 1640), was the eldest son of John, second or seventh earl of Mar [q. v.], by his second wife, Lady Margaret Stuart, daughter of Esme, duke of Lennox. He married Mary Douglas, countess of Buchan, daughter and heiress of James, fifth earl of Buchan, and as-

sumed the title of Earl of Buchan. This title was confirmed to him by a royal charter, dated 22 March 1617, the countess resigning her rights in his favour, and he was allowed the possession and exercise of all honours, dignities, and precedence of former earls of Buchan. A decree of the court of sessions, 25 July 1628, restored to Buchan and his wife the precedency over the earls of Eglinton, Montrose, Cassilis, Caithness, and Glencairn, which had been claimed by them, and granted by a former decree in 1606. On the accession of Charles I, Buchan became one of the lords of the bedchamber. He lived chiefly in London, where he died in 1640. He was buried at Auchterhouse, Forfarshire. His wife died before him in 1628. They left six children, two sons, James, who succeeded to the title, and John, and four daughters.

[Douglas and Wood's Peerage of Scotland.]
A. V.

ERSKINE, JAMES, Lord Grange (1679–1754), judge, second son of Charles, tenth earl of Mar, by Lady Mary Maule, eldest daughter of George, second earl of Panmure, was born in 1679. He was educated for the law, and became a member of the Faculty of Advocates on 28 July 1705. His advancement was very rapid. On 18 Oct. 1706 he was appointed to the bench in succession to Sir Archibald Hope of Rankeillor, and took his seat 18 March 1707. On 6 June of the same year he succeeded Lord Crocerig as a lord of justiciary, and on 27 July 1710 became, with the title of Lord Grange, lord justice clerk, in place of Lord Ormistone. 'This is a fruit,' says Wodrow, 'of Mar's voting for Dr. Sacheverell' (see too *Carstares State Papers*, 787). Though professing rigid piety and strict presbyterian principles and loyalty to the Hanoverian succession, he kept up a connection, as close as it was obscure, with the opposite party, and especially with his brother the Earl of Mar, and was employed by him to draw up the address from the highland chiefs to George I, which was presented to the king on his landing, and was rejected by him. In the rebellion of 1715, however, Grange took no part. He was held in high favour by the stricter presbyterians, took an active share in the affairs of the general assembly, and is said to have found a peculiar pleasure in undertaking any act of rigour or inquisition in church government which required to be performed. He was in particular staunch in the assertion of the utmost freedom of ministers and presbyteries from the control either of lay patrons or the government. Thus in 1713 he urged the lord treasurer not to prosecute recusants who refused to observe the thanksgiving, and when the question of presentations arose in the East Calder case, he advised the ministers to evade the Patronage Act, by agreeing among themselves 'to discourage and bear down all persons who accepted presentations,' so as to cause the presentation to pass by lapse of time from the patron to the presbytery. In 1731 he pushed his opposition against heritors, as heritors, being electors of a minister, 'and to lodge all in the hands of the christian people and communicants' so far as to be accused of causing schism in the church. His piety manifested itself in various ways. He was intimate with and much esteemed by Wodrow, who reckons him 'among the greatest men in this time, and would fain hope the calumnies cast on him are very groundless.' At one time he propounds for discussion, and to pass the time, the question 'wherein the spirits proper work upon the soul did lye;' at another he laments Lord Townsend's withdrawal from public life, 'for he was the only one at court that had any real concern about the interests of religion;' and his casual talk with a barber's lad who was shaving him so moved the boy that it led to his conversion. And yet this pious judge did not escape the abuse of his contemporaries as a jesuit and a Jacobite, a profligate and a pretender to religion, and is thus characterised by the historian of his country.

His treatment of his wife throws some light on his character. She was Rachel Chiesly, a daughter of that Chiesly of Dalry who murdered the lord president of the court of session in the streets of Edinburgh in 1689 (see *Archæologia Scotica*, iv. 15). Grange had first debauched her and married her under compulsion. Proud, violent, and jealous like her family, she was also a drunkard, and at times an imbecile. Grange was constantly absent from her in England; she suspected him, probably not without cause, of infidelity, and set spies about him. Her conduct was an open scandal, and Grange was much pitied by his friends. The story on their side is that she accused him of treason, stole his letters to support the baseless charge, attempted his life, separated from him, and forced a maintenance from him under pressure of legal process. Her misconduct lasted at least from 1730 to 1732, and Grange had other family troubles. His sister-in-law, Lady Mar, was also, it appeared, at times insane, and he endeavoured in April 1731, under some form of law, to carry her off from England to Scotland 'for the advantage of her family,' but was thwarted by her sister, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, with a warrant from the king's bench. Lady Mar remained in Lady Mary's custody for some

years. 'His health,' writes Wodrow in 1731, 'is much broken this winter and spring.' But in 1732 these scandals and his wife's existence came to an end, and he publicly celebrated her funeral. Nevertheless she was alive till 1745, and a prisoner beyond the ken of friends till her death. She lodged with a highland woman, a Maclean, in Edinburgh. One winter's night, when Lady Grange was on the point of going to London (22 Jan. 1732), this woman introduced some highlanders in Lovat's tartan into the chamber, who violently overpowered Lady Grange, carried her off in a chair beyond the walls, and thence on horseback to Linlithgow, to the house of one Macleod, an advocate. Thence she was taken to Falkirk, thence to Pomeise, where she was concealed thirteen weeks in a closet, and thence by Stirling into the highlands, till, travelling by night, and not sleeping in a bed for weeks together, she was brought in a sloop to the island of Hesker. This operation was actually conducted by Alexander Foster of Carsbonny, and a page of Grange's, Peter Fraser, but several highland chieftains, Lord Lovat, Sir Alexander Macdonald, and Macleod of Muiravondale, were privy to and participators in the affair. For ten months she was kept in Hesker without even bread, and thence was removed to St. Kilda. This was her prison for seven years. For long she had no attendant but one man, who spoke little English. Then a minister and his wife arrived, who did indeed commit her story to writing, 21 Jan. 1741, but were afraid otherwise to interfere in her behalf. At length the daughter of a catechist conveyed a message to her friends to the mainland, hid in a clew of wool. They despatched a brig to her assistance, and she was thereupon removed by her captors to Assynt, Sutherlandshire, and finally to Skye, where she died in May 1745, and was buried at Dunvegan, Inverness-shire.

The story of Lady Grange forcibly illustrates the close solidarity and secrecy of the highland Jacobites; and though Grange's account of the matter was that her insanity made confinement necessary, it is clear the Jacobite organisation would not have been employed in a private quarrel, or in so relentless a manner, unless Lady Grange had command of secrets which might have cost the lives of others besides her husband.

Grange certainly was connected with the Jacobites at various times. In 1726 the suspicion against him was strong, and in 1727 he was able to say from personal knowledge that the Jacobites were weary of the Pretender and were turning towards the king. But his main policy was to oppose Walpole. He was endeavouring to enter parliament with the view of joining the opposition, when Walpole inserted in his act regulating Scotch elections a clause excluding Scotch judges from the House of Commons. Grange at once resigned his judgeship, and was elected for Stirlingshire in 1734. With Dundas of Arniston he was one of the principal advisers of the peers of the opposition in 1734. In 1736 he vehemently opposed the abolition of the statutes against witchcraft. Walpole is said to have declared that from that moment he had nothing to fear from him. Though he became secretary to the Prince of Wales, his hopes of the secretaryship for Scotland were disappointed. For a time he returned to the Edinburgh bar, but without success, and having lived during his latter years in London died there 20 Jan. 1754. He was poor in his latter years, and there is evidence to show that he eventually married a woman named Lyndsay, a keeper of a coffee-house in the Haymarket, whom he had long lived with as his mistress. He had four sons, of whom the eldest, Charles (*b.* 27 Aug. 1709, *d.* 1774), was in the army, and John, the youngest (1720–1796), was dean of Cork, and four daughters, of whom Mary (*b.* 5 July 1714, *d.* 9 May 1772) married John, third earl of Kintore, 21 Aug. 1729.

[Burton's Hist. of Scotland, 1689–1748; Wodrow's Analecta; Lord Grange's Letters in Spalding Club Miscellanies, vol. iii.; W. M. Thomas's Memoir of Lady M. Wortley Montagu; Wharncliffe's ed. of her Works, 1861; Omond's Arniston Memoirs; Chambers's Domestic Annals of Scotland, iii. 578; Chambers's Journal, March 1846 and July 1874; Proceedings of Soc. Scottish Antiquaries, vol. xi.; J. Maidment's Diary of a Senator of the College of Justice, 1843; Scott's Tales of a Grandfather; Boswell's Johnson (Croker); Gent. Mag. 1754; Scots Mag. 1817, p. 333; Brunton and Haig's College of Senators, p. 485; Douglas's Scotch Peerage, ii. 219.] J. A. H.

ERSKINE, SIR JAMES ST. CLAIR, second EARL OF ROSSLYN (1762–1837), general, was the elder son of Lieutenant-general Sir Henry Erskine (*d.* 1765) [q.v.], a distinguished officer, who had acted as deputy quartermaster-general in the attack on L'Orient in 1746, by Janet, only daughter of Peter Wedderburn, a Scotch lord of session under the title of Lord Chesterhall, and only sister of Alexander Wedderburn, lord chancellor of England from 1793 to 1801, who was created successively Lord Loughborough and Earl of Rosslyn, with remainder in default of issue to this nephew. Sir Henry Erskine, who was the fifth baronet of Alva, succeeded his uncle, General the Hon. James St. Clair, as colonel of the 1st regiment, or Royal Scots,

and died on 9 Aug. 1765, when he was succeeded by his eldest son, James Erskine, then only three years old, whose education and career were carefully watched and forwarded by his maternal uncle, the celebrated Alexander Wedderburn.

Erskine was educated at the Edinburgh Academy, and entered the army as a cornet in the 1st horse grenadier guards, afterwards the 1st life guards. He was rapidly promoted, and became lieutenant first in the 38th regiment, and then in the 2nd dragoons, or Scots greys, in 1778, and captain in the 19th light dragoons in 1780, from which he was transferred to the 14th light dragoons in 1781. In the following year he was appointed aide-de-camp to the viceroy of Ireland and assistant adjutant-general in that kingdom, and in 1783 he was promoted major into the 8th light dragoons. In 1781 he had been elected M.P. for Castle Rising through the influence of his uncle, who had become lord chief justice of the court of common pleas, and been created Lord Loughborough in the previous year. Erskine exchanged his seat of Castle Rising for Morpeth in 1784, and soon made himself some reputation in the House of Commons as the representative of his uncle's opinions. He was one of the managers of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, and while Lord Loughborough was intriguing for the chancellorship he voted against the measures of Pitt. On 9 June 1789 he took the name of St. Clair in addition to his own, on succeeding, on the death of Colonel Paterson St. Clair, to the estates of his grandmother, the Hon. Catherine St. Clair, who had married Sir John Erskine, third baronet, and in 1790 he was elected M.P. for the Kirkcaldy burghs, a seat which he held until his succession to the peerage. On 14 March 1792 Erskine was promoted lieutenant-colonel into the 12th light dragoons, and in the following year, in which his uncle became lord chancellor, he abandoned politics as an active pursuit and devoted himself to his profession. He was first sent to the Mediterranean in that year to act as adjutant-general to the army under Sir David Dundas before Toulon, and served in that capacity at Toulon, and in the subsequent operations in Corsica, including the capture of Calvi and of San Fiorenze. He was appointed aide-de-camp to the king and promoted colonel on 28 May 1795, and was in the following year sent to Portugal with the temporary rank of brigadier-general to act as adjutant-general to lieutenant-general the Hon. Sir Charles Stuart [q. v.], commanding the army in that country. He was promoted major-general on 1 Jan. 1798, and continued to serve under Sir Charles Stuart, to whom he was second in command at the capture of Minorca in that year, and whom he succeeded as commander-in-chief in the Mediterranean. He returned to England on the arrival of Sir Ralph Abercromby at the close of 1799, and was appointed colonel of the Sussex fencible cavalry, which regiment was, however, reduced in 1800. He commanded a division in Scotland from November 1800 till December 1801, when he was made colonel of the 9th light dragoons, and again from June 1803 to 1 Jan. 1805, when he was promoted lieutenant-general. Two days afterwards, on 3 Jan. 1805, he succeeded his uncle, the ex-lord chancellor, as second Lord Loughborough and second Earl of Rosslyn, under special clauses in the patents conferring those honours upon him in 1795 and 1801. On his promotion he was transferred to the Irish staff, where he commanded the south-western district until 1806, when he was sent on his celebrated special mission to Lisbon with General J. G. Simcoe. The mission was to report whether the British government should actively assist the Portuguese against Napoleon, and the result of that report was the despatch of Sir Arthur Wellesley to the Peninsula. Rosslyn was unable to accept a command there on account of his seniority to Sir Arthur Wellesley, though after the death of Sir John Moore his name was mentioned as his possible successor, because of his previous knowledge of the country in 1796. He commanded a division under Lord Cathcart in Denmark in 1807, and under Lord Chatham in the Walcheren in 1809. He commanded the south-eastern district, with his headquarters at Canterbury, from 1812 to 1814, in which year he was promoted general, and then he again turned his attention to politics. He was a strong tory of the old school, and an intimate friend of the Duke of Wellington. He acted as whip to the tory party in the House of Lords for many years, though his sentiments in favour of catholic emancipation had been known ever since 1807. He was largely rewarded with honours, and was, among other rewards, made an extra G.C.B. on the accession of George IV, and lord-lieutenant of Fifeshire. After the Duke of Wellington came into office as prime minister, Rosslyn entered the cabinet as lord privy seal, and was sworn of the privy council. He was also lord president of the council in the Duke of Wellington's short-lived cabinet of December 1834. He died on 18 Jan. 1837, at Dysart House, Fifeshire, at the age of seventy-five.

[Royal Military Calendar; Gent. Mag. April 1837.] H. M. S.

ERSKINE, JOHN, sixth LORD ERSKINE, and first or sixth EARL OF MAR of the Erskine line (*d.* 1572), regent of Scotland, was the third and eldest surviving son of John, fifth lord Erskine, and Lady Margaret Campbell, daughter of Archibald, second earl of Argyll. The family traced their descent in the female line from Gratney, earl of Mar (successor of the ancient Mormaers of Mar), who married Christiana Bruce, sister of Robert I. In the male line they had as a progenitor Henry de Erskine or Areskine, who was proprietor of the barony of that name in Renfrewshire as early as the reign of Alexander II. His descendant, Sir Thomas Erskine, married Janet Keith, great-granddaughter of Gratney, earl of Mar; and Robert, son of Sir Thomas Erskine, on the death of Alexander Stewart, husband of Isabel, countess of Mar, liferent earl, claimed the title, but the claim was not recognised. The fifth Lord Erskine had a charter in 1525 constituting him captain and constable of the castle of Stirling. He was guardian of James V during his minority, and subsequently of his daughter Mary, afterwards queen of Scotland. Some time before his death in 1552 he had also been keeper of Edinburgh Castle. The sixth Lord Erskine had been educated for the church, and became prospective heir unexpectedly through the death of two brothers. After the death of his father the castle of Edinburgh came into the hands of the Duke of Chatelherault, but when in 1554 he agreed to recognise the regency of the queen dowager, the charge of it was given to the sixth Lord Erskine until the duke should demit his authority to the parliament (CALDERWOOD, *History*, i. 282). This having been done, the custody of the castle was committed by the parliament to Erskine, with provision that he should deliver it up to none except with the consent of the estates, the proviso being added to guard against the possibility of its falling into the hands of the French. At this time Erskine had not become a supporter of the reformed doctrines, and although he afterwards joined the reformed party, his natural temperament, as well as the position of neutrality which accidental circumstances had assigned him, prevented him from ever assuming the character of a partisan. Along with Lord Lorne, afterwards fifth earl of Argyll, and Lord James Stuart, afterwards earl of Moray, he attended the preaching of Knox at Calder in 1556 (KNOX, *Works*, i. 249), and he also signed the joint letter of these two lords and the Earl of Glencairn inviting Knox in 1557 to return from Geneva (CALDERWOOD, i. 319). At the beginning of the dispute with the queen regent in 1559 he, however, intervened on her behalf to prevent the surrender of Perth (KNOX, *Works*, i. 358), which nevertheless took place on 26 June, and subsequently he appeared on her behalf at the conference at Preston (*ib.* 369). In all this it is evident that his chief motive was to prevent the miseries of civil war. For himself he recognised that he was bound to maintain a strict neutrality. He therefore permitted the French troops of the queen to enter the city, a proceeding which so much discouraged the lords of the congregation that on 24 July they signed a truce. Knox wrote on 23 Aug. to Crofts that the queen dowager 'has corrupted (as is suspected) Lord Erskine, captain of the castle, and hopes to receive it' (*State Papers*, For. Ser. 1558-9, entry 1234), but the suspicion proved entirely groundless. On 19 Sept. the lords sent him a letter warning him against permitting the queen regent to fortify Leith (KNOX, i. 415–7), but he paid no heed to the communication. At last he told them plainly that he could promise them no friendship, but must needs declare himself friend to those that were able to support and defend him (CALDERWOOD, i. 553), whereupon on 5 Nov. they resolved to evacuate the city and retire to Stirling. At the same time he seems to have given them to understand that his sympathies were entirely with them in the struggle with the queen regent (Sadler to Cecil, 8 Nov. 1559, *Cal. State Papers*, For. Ser. 1559–60, entry 211). Subsequently he declared that he would keep the castle till discharged by parliament (Sadler to Cecil, 5 Dec. 1559, *ib.* 383), and requested the lords to aid him if need be. At the special request of the queen regent he consented, on the approach of the English army, to receive her into the castle (CALDERWOOD, i. 582), but this was avowedly a mere act of courtesy, and also enabled him to intervene more effectually in the cause of peace, for, as Calderwood remarks, 'he had both her and the castle at command' (*ib.*)

According to Knox, Mar was the 'chief great man that had professed Christ Jesus' who refused to subscribe the 'Book of Discipline' in 1560 (*Works*, ii. 128). At his lack of ardour Knox professes to feel no surprise, 'for besydis that he has a verray Jesabell to his wyffe, yf the poore, the schooles, the ministerie of the kirk had thair awin, his keching wold lack two parttis and more of that whiche he injustlie now possesses' (*ib.*) The lady to whom this unflattering epithet was applied by Knox was Annabella Murray, daughter of Sir William Murray of Tullibardine, and of Catherine, daughter of Sir Duncan Campbell of Glenurchy. She had the reputation of being avaricious (LORD

Thirlstane's 'Admonition to my Lord Mar, Regent,' published in *Ancient Scottish Poems*, 1786), and subsequently was for a time one of the special friends of Queen Mary, a fact which sufficiently explains Knox's harsh comparison. On the return of Queen Mary in 1561 Erskine was appointed a member of the privy council. He received also a grant of several church lands, but his claims to the earldom of Mar were at first disregarded, and the title was bestowed on Lord James Stuart. Although Erskine favoured Elizabeth's proposal for a marriage between Queen Mary and Leicester (Randolph to Cecil, 24 Dec. 1564, in Keith, *History*, ii. 260), he, on becoming aware of the sentiments of Mary, cordially supported the marriage with Darnley. In this he was probably influenced by his wife, who was now frequently in Mary's company (*Miscellaneous Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots*, Maitland Club, i. 125), and was no doubt anxious to obtain for her husband the earldom of Mar. Both Lord and Lady Erskine were present with the queen in the journey from Perth to Callendar, near Falkirk, when it was rumoured that Argyll and Moray lay in wait for her in Fife in order to prevent the marriage, and Erskine wrote a letter to his nephew Moray asking an explanation of his being at Lochleven, who ascribed it to illness (Randolph to Cecil, 4 July, in Keith, ii. 313–14). Although, in deference to the claims of Erskine, Mary in 1562 changed the earldom conferred on Lord James Stuart from that of Mar to that of Moray, it was not till 23 June 1565 that Erskine received a patent granting to him, his heirs and assignees the entire earldom of Mar, as possessed from ancient times by the Countess Isabel. The patent was ratified by act of parliament on 19 April 1567, which recited that it was 'disponit' to him on the ground that he was 'lauchfullie discendit of the ancient heretouris of the said erledom, and had the undoubtit right thereof' (*Acts Parl. Scot.* ii. 549). On account of the right of descent recognised in the patent Erskine and his successors claimed to have precedency of all other earls in Scotland as possessing the most ancient earldom in the kingdom, but in 1875 the House of Lords decided in favour of the Earl of Kellie that the old earldom of Mar had become extinct before its revival in 1565, and that the earldom then conferred on Erskine was a creation and not a restitution or recognition of well-founded claims. The justice of the decision has been much questioned by Scotch lawyers and genealogists (the case as against the Earl of Kellie is exhaustively set forth in the Earl of Crawford's 'Earldom of Mar in Sunshine and Shade'), and has been practically reversed by the act of parliament (6 Aug. 1885). The newly recognised Earl of Mar was present at the marriage of Mary and Darnley, and he assisted in the suppression of Moray's rebellion, accompanying the king, who led the battle (*Reg. Privy Council of Scot.* i. 379). On 18 July 1566 he received a charter from Queen Mary and King Henry confirming his captaincy or custody of the castle of Stirling, with the parks, gardens, &c. The accouchement of the queen had taken place in the castle of Edinburgh, of which he was still keeper, and after her recovery she went for change of air, accompanied by him and the Earl of Moray, to his castle near Alloa (Holinshed, *Chronicle*).

Mar was absolutely free from any connection with the murder either of Rizzio or of Darnley. While lying ill at Stirling shortly before the trial of Bothwell for the latter murder, he consented that his friends should deliver up the castle of Edinburgh to Bothwell (Calderwood, ii. 348). Calderwood asserts that the castle should not have been given up without the consent of the estates, but it is clear that the presence of Mary in Scotland entirely altered the conditions on which it was held by Mar. For delivering it up he received an exoneration from the queen and privy council 19 March 1566–7, and this was confirmed by parliament on 16 April. On the 19th he was confirmed in his captainship of the castle of Stirling, the arrangement having been previously agreed to that he should be there entrusted with the guardianship of the young prince. After Bothwell had got the lords—not, however, including Mar, who was not asked—to sign the bond in favour of his marriage with the queen, Mary, on 26 April, paid a visit to the young prince at Stirling; but Mar, suspecting that she intended if possible to carry him with her to Edinburgh, would permit no one to enter the royal apartments along with her except two of her ladies (*ib.* ii. 356; Drury to Cecil, 27 April 1567). After the marriage Bothwell made strenuous efforts to get the prince delivered into his hands, 'bot my lord of Mar,' says Sir James Melville, 'wha was a trew nobleman, wuld not delyuer him out of his custody, alleging that he culd not without consent of the thre estaitis' (*Memoirs*, 179). Mar applied to Sir James Melville to assist him by his counsel or in any other way he could, who thereupon prevailed upon Sir James Balfour to retain the castle of Edinburgh in his hands and not deliver it up to Bothwell (*ib.* 180). To gain time Mar at last agreed to deliver up the prince, on condition that an 'honest, responsible

nobleman' were made captain of the castle of Edinburgh to whom he might be entrusted (*ib.* 181). Previous to this, however, the nobles, convened secretly at Stirling, had signed the bond for the prince's protection, and soon afterwards they announced their purpose to be revenged on Bothwell as the chief author of the king's murder. Thus the incorruptible integrity of Mar proved the turning-point in the fate of Bothwell and the queen. He was one of the leaders of the forces of the insurgents, was present at the surrender of Mary at Carberrie Hill on 14 June 1567, and on the 16th signed the order for her commitment to Lochleven Castle. He was also one of the council to whom on 24 July she demitted the government. On the 29th the young prince was crowned at Stirling, Mar carrying him in his arms in the procession from the church to his chamber in the castle. Throgmorton, at the instance of Elizabeth, endeavoured to get Mar to interfere on behalf of Mary; but although Mar expressed his desire to do what he could for her by way of persuasion, he told him: 'To save her life by endangering her son or his estate, or by betraying my marrows, I will never do it, my lord ambassador, for all the gowd in the world' (Throgmorton to Leicester, 9 Aug. 1567). On the escape of Queen Mary he sent a supply of men from Stirling to the regent, and he was present at the battle of Langside, 13 May 1568 (Calderwood, ii. 415). When the regent Moray was murdered he wrote to Elizabeth informing her of the danger that had thus arisen to the young king of Scotland, and craving her assistance (*Cal. State Papers*, For. Ser. 1569–71, entry 647). He was one of the noblemen who bore the regent's body at his funeral, and shortly afterwards it was reported that 'he had fallen sick with sorrow taken for the regent's death' (*ib.* entry 677). On 28 April an attempt was made by the Hamiltons to surprise him at Avonbridge, on his way to Edinburgh with a thousand men, but having learned their intention he crossed the river two miles above, and joined the Earl of Morton, who was also on the march to Edinburgh with a thousand foot and five hundred horse (Bannatyne, *Memorials*, 38; Herries, *Memoirs*, 126). When the king's party were surprised at Stirling on 3 Sept. 1571, and a number of them taken prisoners, Mar, by planting a party in an unfinished mansion of his own—still standing at the head of the Broad Street, Stirling, and known as Mar's work—and opening fire on the intruders, drove them from the market-place (Buchanan, *Hist. of Scot.*) The regent Lennox having been killed in the fray, Mar was by general consent chosen regent. On the 10th he came to Leith, where he proclaimed Morton lieutenant-general of the forces (Bannatyne, *Memorials*, 187). Morton, in fact, by his overmastering will, and his close connection with Elizabeth, was already the real governor of Scotland, Mar being the mere instrument, and occasionally an unwilling one, in carrying out Morton's policy. After consulting with Morton, Mar returned to Stirling to collect forces for the siege of Edinburgh Castle, which had been in the hands of the party of Mary since the death of the regent Moray. On the 14th of the following month he arrived at Edinburgh with four thousand men, artillery being sent from Stirling by sea. With this reinforcement he attempted to storm the castle, and made a breach in the walls, but afraid to carry it by assault retired upon Leith, and advised Morton to write to Elizabeth for assistance. It was probably to gratify Elizabeth and induce her to comply with these requests that, under the auspices of Mar, a convention was held at Leith in the following January at which episcopacy was established. For a similar reason, also, Mar unwillingly consented that Northumberland should be delivered up to Elizabeth on payment of 2,000*l.* to Sir William Douglas [q. v.] nominally for his maintenance in Lochleven. Still Elizabeth hesitated to commit herself, and as she blamed him for standing to too hard terms with them (Elizabeth to the Earl of Mar, 4 July), he at last, 'for reverence of her majesty' (Mar to Burghley, 1 Aug.), agreed on 30 July to an 'abstinence' for two months ('Abstinence,' imprinted at Edinburgh by Thomas Bassandyne, reprinted in Calderwood, *Hist.* iii. 215–16). On 22 Sept. Mar came to Leith to conduct negotiations, but no agreement was arrived at, and after the duration of the abstinence had been extended for eight days, a continuance was proclaimed on 8 Oct. till 6 Dec. (*ib.* iii. 225). Mar had employed Sir James Melville to sound the holders of the castle as to their desire for peace, the words of Mar, as quoted by Melville, being to show them 'not as fra me, that ye vnderstand that I persaue, albeit ouer lait, how that we ar all led opon the yce, and that all gud Scottismen wald fayn agre and satle the estait' (*Memoirs*, 247). So highly satisfied, apparently, was Mar with Melville's report, that he agreed to call a meeting of the lords to persuade them to come to an agreement. 'Meantime,' adds Melville, 'vntill the apponted consaill day he past to Dalkeith, where he was will traited and banketed with my lord Mortoun' (*ib.* 248). It was at Dalkeith that, on 9 Oct., took place in Mor-

ton's bedchamber the remarkable conference between Morton, Mar, and Killigrew, when the latter made the proposal on behalf of Elizabeth for the delivering up of Mary to her enemies in Scotland with a view to her execution (Cecil to Leicester, 9 Oct.) Killigrew reported that he found the regent 'more cold' than Morton, but that he yet seemed 'glad and desirous to have it come to pass' (Killigrew to Burghley, 9 Oct.) Immediately after the conference Mar retired to Stirling, and Killigrew followed him there on the 16th. Writing from Stirling on the 19th, Killigrew reports: 'I perceive the regent's first coldness grew rather for want of skill how to compass so great a matter than for lack of good will to execute the same.' Shortly after the ambassador's interview the regent was seized with a violent sickness, of which he died on 29 Oct. 1572. His illness was attributed by many to a disagreement with Morton in regard to the surrender of the castle (Melville, *Memoirs*, 249; *Historie of James Sext*, 120). Being a 'man of meik and humayne nature, inclynit to all kynd of quyetness and modestie,' says the author of the 'Historie of James Sext,' he, on account of Morton's refusal to come to terms with those in the castle, 'decreittit na langer to remayne in Edinburgh, and tharefore depairtit to Sterling, whare for greif of mynd he deit.' Mar had undoubtedly deeper causes for agitation, if not grief, than was suspected by those outside the secret conference.

Mar, in his difficult position as keeper of the young king, succeeded in winning the respect of both parties. The fact that his abilities were not of the highest order rather fitted him than otherwise for this position. As regent he was, however, merely the tool of Morton; for though actuated always in the discharge of his public duties by a high sense of honour, he had neither the force of character nor the power of initiative to enable him to carry out an independent policy in difficult circumstances. His wife, Annabella Murray, described by Knox as a 'very Jesabell,' on her husband's death remained along with Alexander Erskine in charge of the young king. She was, says Sir James Melville, 'wyse and schairp, and held the king in gret aw' (*Memoirs*, 262). King James was so sensible of the services she had rendered him that he placed the young Prince Henry under her charge (Birch, *Life of Prince Henry*, 11). In 1599 she is described as 'haveng hir body waist and extenuatit by hir former service' (*Reg. Privy Council Scot.* vi. 18), but she survived at least to 1602 (*ib.* 727). They had one son, John [q. v.], who succeeded to the earldom, and a daughter, Mary, who became Countess of Angus. Mar's will is printed in 'Notes and Queries,' 4th ser. viii. 321–4.

[Reg. Privy Council of Scotland; State Papers during the reign of Elizabeth; Reports of Hist. MSS. Commission, ii. iii. and v., passim; Knox's Works; Calderwood's Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland; Keith's Hist. of Scotland; Spotiswood's Hist. of the Church of Scotland; Sir James Melville's Memoirs; Richard Bannatyne's Memorials; Hist. of James Sext; Herries's Hist. of the Reign of Marie; Sadler State Papers; Stevenson's Illustrations of the Reign of Queen Mary; Buchanan's Hist. of Scotland; Douglas's Scottish Peerage (Wood), ii. 211–12; the Earl of Crawford's Earldom of Mar in Sunshine and Shade, 2 vols. 1882; the histories of Tytler, Hill Burton, and Froude.] T. F. H.

ERSKINE, JOHN (1509–1591), of Dun, Scottish reformer, was descended from a branch of the family of Erskine of Erskine, afterwards earls of Mar, the earliest of the Dun branch being Sir Thomas Erskine, who had a charter of that barony from Robert II, dated 8 Nov. 1376. The reformer was the son of Sir John Erskine, fifth laird of Dun, by his wife, Margaret Ruthven, countess dowager of Buchan, and was born in 1509. Four of his near relatives—his grandfather, father, granduncle, and uncle—were slain at Flodden in 1513. The wills and inventories of the grandfather and father ('Dun Papers' in *Spalding Club Miscellany*, iv. 10–16) prove that the family was exceptionally wealthy. His uncle, Sir Thomas Erskine of Brechin, secretary to James V, now became his guardian, and was specially careful to give him a good education. Bowick, in his 'Life of John Erskine,' states that he was educated at King's College, Aberdeen. M'Crie, in his 'Life of Melville,' wrongly interpreting a passage in James Melville's 'Diary,' states that Richard Melville, eldest brother of Andrew Melville, in the capacity of tutor accompanied Erskine to Wittemberg, where they studied under Melanchthon; but this Erskine is only described as '*James* Erskine, apperand of Dun,' and as a matter of fact Richard Melville was more than twelve years the junior of John Erskine, having been born in 1522. In 1530 or 1531 Erskine, probably accidentally, was the cause of the death of Sir William Froster, a priest, in the bell tower of Montrose (Instrument of Sir William Froster's assythment, 5 Feb. 1530–1, in *Spalding Club Miscellany*, iv. 27–8). This may have been the reason of his going abroad, where he is supposed to have studied at a university. On his return he brought with him a French gentleman, Petrus de Marsiliers, whom he established at Montrose to teach Greek, 'nocht heard of

before' in Scotland (James Melville, *Diary* 31), a step which had no inconsiderable results in hastening the Reformation. From the Frenchman Andrew Melville obtained sufficient knowledge of the language to enable him when he went to St. Andrews to study Aristotle in the original, 'quhilk his maisters understood nocht' (*ib.*); in this way also George Wishart acquired the knowledge of Greek which enabled him to teach the Greek New Testament in Montrose; and David Stratoun of Lauriestoun, who suffered at the stake in 1534, was probably taught by the same master, for it was when reading the New Testament with Erskine that he chanced on the words which made him resolve never to deny the truth 'for fear of death or bodily pain' (Calderwood, *Hist.* i. 107).

Soon after his return from abroad Erskine married Elizabeth Lindsay, daughter of the Earl of Crawford (Precept of Sasine by David, earl of Crawford, 20 Oct. 1535, *Spalding Club Miscellany*, iv. 29). In 1537 he, along with his son John and other relatives, obtained a license from the king to travel in France, Italy, 'or any uther beyond se,' for the space of three years (*ib.* 30), and in 1542 he obtained a similar license for two years (*ib.* 43). His first wife died 29 July 1538, and his marriage to Barbara de Beirle took place possibly when abroad, but at any rate previous to September 1543. A letter of Cardinal Beaton to Erskine, 25 Oct. 1544 (*ib.* 45-6), asking him to meet him at St. Andrews that they might journey together to the meeting of the estates at Edinburgh, at which the treaties with England were annulled, was probably dictated by his doubts as to Erskine's sentiments towards these proposals. There is no evidence whether Erskine kept the appointment; but as the special friend of Wishart and other reformers, it cannot be supposed that he was quite cordial in his support of Beaton. Before Wishart set out on his fatal journey to Edinburgh in the following year, he visited Montrose, and it was 'sore against the judgement of the laird of Dun' (Knox, *Works*, i. 132) that he 'entered in his journey.' Undoubtedly, however, Erskine, as his whole career bears witness, was less extreme in his views than the ecclesiastics among the reformers, and less obnoxious to the catholics, while his wealth and his influence rendered it imprudent to interfere with him. When, after the assassination of Beaton in 1546, the queen dowager in 1547 was deserted by many of the nobility, who combined with the English against her, Erskine gave her valuable support. In the capacity of constable of Montrose he repelled an attempt of the English to land at the town, and received from the queen regent her hearty thanks for his 'gude service done onto our derrest daughter your souerane and hir auctoryte' (*Spalding Club Miscellany*, iv. 48). Some time afterwards the occupation of the fort, or Constable Hill, of Montrose by the French under Captain Beauschattel caused him some uneasiness, for on 29 Aug. 1549 the queen regent wrote to assure him that this was not to be regarded as in any way superseding his authority (*ib.* 51).

Erskine was one of the first to attend the private exhortations of Knox after his arrival in Scotland in the autumn of 1555 (Knox, *Works*, i. 246). It was while at supper at the laird of Dun's lodgings that Knox persuaded some of his principal followers openly to discountenance the mass (*ib.* 249). Shortly afterwards he brought Knox to his house at Dun, where Knox remained a month, the principal gentry of the district being invited to meet him (*ib.*) The name of Erskine of Dun stands fourth among the signatures to the first bond of the Scottish reformers, 3 Dec. 1557, inviting Knox to return from Geneva (*ib.* 273). On the 14th of the same month he was appointed one of the commissioners to witness the marriage of the young queen Mary with the dauphin of France, and arrange its conditions, representing, along with James Stuart, afterwards Earl of Moray, the views of the reforming party (Calderwood, *History*, i. 330). After his return he was chosen an elder, and along with other zealous laymen began to address the meetings held for prayer and the reading of the scriptures (Knox, i. 300). When the reformed preachers were summoned to appear before the queen regent at Stirling on 10 May 1559, for refusing to attend the mass, they prudently determined to send Erskine of Dun—described by Knox as a 'man most gentill of nature, and most addict to please hir in all things not repugnant to God'—to confer with her on the matter. On the faith of her apparently conciliatory attitude Erskine advised them that they need not appear, but when they failed to do so, she made this an excuse for putting them to the horn, whereupon, fearing imprisonment, he withdrew, and came to the reformers assembled at Perth. His representation to them regarding what Knox calls her 'craft and falsehood' was, according to the same authority, the real cause of the outbreak of indignation among the multitude, which found vent in the destruction of the monasteries of the town. Subsequently he was one of the principals in the negotiations which led to a cessation of hostilities. When the queen regent soon afterwards broke her agreement with them, he attended the meeting of

the leading reformers summoned for 4 June at St. Andrews to 'concurre in the work of the reformation.' He also signed the act of 23 Oct. 1559 suspending her from the regency, and he subscribed the instructions to the commissioners that went to Berwick in February 1560 to form a contract with Elizabeth. In July following he accepted an office which identified him for the rest of his life with the reformed church of Scotland as completely as if he had been an ecclesiastic. When the assembly decided to appoint superintendents for the different districts of Scotland, it followed almost as a matter of course that he, though a layman, should be appointed superintendent for Angus and Mearns (*ib.* ii. 363).

Erskine was the only person present at Knox's stormy interview with Queen Mary. Mary, exasperated beyond endurance by the terse denunciations of Knox, gave way to a paroxysm of passion. Erskine was never addicted to strong language, and probably recognised that Knox had blundered in his diplomacy as well as violated good manners. At any rate he attempted to take the sting out of Knox's remonstrances by 'many pleasing wordis of hir beautie, of hir excellence, and how that all the princes of Europe wold be glaid to seak hir favouris' (*ib.* ii. 388). Knox unconcernedly adds that the only 'effect of this was to cast oil on the flaming fire,' but at all events it diverted her anger from Erskine, and in all probability, but for his considerate persuasions when he remained with her in the cabinet after Knox was dismissed, she would have been content with nothing less than bringing the matter before the lords of the articles. Indeed, the compliments of the laird of Dun, when Mary's pride had been so ruthlessly wounded, seem really to have left a very favourable impression of him; for when at the conference held with the lords at Perth in May 1565, in reference to the marriage with Darnley, she expressed her willingness to hear public preaching 'out of the mouth of such as pleased' her, thereby plainly intending to exclude Knox, she mentioned that above all others 'she would gladly hear the superintendent of Angus, for he was a mild and sweet-natured man, with true honesty and uprightness' (*ib.* 482). Erskine's rare union of steadfastness to his convictions with a conciliatory manner gained him at this time a peculiar influence among the reforming party. Many of the nobility of the party were not primarily actuated by ecclesiastical or even religious motives, and Erskine formed in a great measure the bond of connection between them and the 'congregation.' It was probably chiefly on this account that, though a layman, he was chosen moderator of the general assembly which met at Edinburgh 25 Dec. 1564, and of the three assemblies succeeding the marriage of Mary with Darnley, viz. 25 Dec. 1565, 25 June 1566, and 25 Dec. 1566. In 1564 he was elected also provost of Montrose. After the murder of Darnley he aided in the coronation of the young prince James at Stirling, 29 July 1567, and along with the Earl of Morton took the oath on the prince's behalf to maintain the protestant religion (*ib.* vi. 556). In 1569, by command of the general assembly, he held a visitation at Aberdeen, and suspended the principal and several professors of King's College from their offices for adherence to popery (Calderwood, ii. 492). On account of certain letters proclaimed by the regent in St. Andrews in November 1571, dismissing the collectors of the thirds of the benefices, Erskine on the 10th wrote him a remonstrance in the form of a short dissertation on the respective provinces of the civil and ecclesiastical powers (printed in Calderwood, iii. 156–62; Bannatyne, *Memoriales*, 197–203; and Wodrow, *Collections*, i. 36–41). Four days later he wrote him, in reference to a proposed convention at Leith, asserting that he saw no reason why he and others should attend a convention where their counsel would not be received (Bannatyne, 203–4; Wodrow, 43–4). To these two letters the regent replied on the 15th (Calderwood, iii. 162–5; Bannatyne, 205–6; Wodrow, 44–6) in such a conciliatory manner, that Erskine was induced to use his influence in securing the attendance of the superintendents and others at the convention, which was finally fixed at Leith for 12 Jan. Wodrow asserts that Erskine agreed to the modified form of episcopacy then introduced, only under protestation until better times; but it is plain from his subsequent conduct that his objections to it were by no means so strong as those of the extreme presbyterians. At the general assembly convened in the Tolbooth of Perth on the 16th of the following August he was again chosen moderator (Calderwood, iii. 219), and his influence doubtless aided in preventing an open breach between the two parties. As a token of his consent to the introduction of episcopacy, he intimated his desire, after the appointment of a bishop to St. Andrews, to be relieved of his duties of superintendent within that diocese, to be followed also with their cessation within the diocese of Dunkeld as soon as a bishop should be appointed there (*ib.* iii. 273). The new policy, however, met with so much resistance that it was never fully carried into effect, and Erskine retained his office of superintendent

to within a few years of his death. In 1578 he assisted in the compilation of the 'Second Book of Discipline,' and was appointed moderator at the conference of commissioners convened for this purpose on 22 Dec. in a chamber of Stirling Castle (*ib.* iii. 433). On 14 May of this year he was commanded by the king to recover Redcastle, near Arbroath, from James Gray, son of Lord Gray, and his accomplices (*Spalding Club Miscellany*, iv. 60), and having done so to the satisfaction of the king, he was relieved of his trust on 1 Sept. 1579 (*Reg. Privy Council of Scotland*, iii. 211). At the parliament of the following November he was named one of the twenty-seven persons constituting the king's council (*ib.* 234). A license from the king, with consent of the privy council, dated 25 Feb. 1584, to John Erskine to eat flesh during Lent, and as often as he pleases during the forbidden days, supplies an interesting proof of the survival of catholic customs in Scotland after the Reformation. Erskine gave his support to the claims made by the king in 1584 to exercise supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, and was induced to use his influence to get the ministers within his district to subscribe an obligation recognising the king's jurisdiction, an intervention whose effectiveness led Calderwood to assert that the laird of Dun 'was a pest then to the ministers in the north' (*History*, iv. 351).

Subsequently Erskine served on various commissions of the assembly, and he held the office of superintendent at least as late as 1589. He died either 12 March 1591 (Johnstone, *Poems on Scottish Martyrs*) or 17 June of that year (Obitis of the Lairdis and Ladeis of Dune in *Spalding Club Miscellany*, iv. lxxviii). M'Crie, in his 'Life of Melville,' gives the date 21 Oct. 1592, but this is founded on mistaking his will for that of his son John, who died at that date (*ib.*) There is no record of any other of his children. He is described by Buchanan as 'homo doctus, et perinde pius et humanus,' and by Spotiswood as 'a baron of good rank, wise, learned, liberal, and of singular courage, who for diverse resemblances may well be said to have been another Ambrose.'

[Bowick's Life of Erskine; Dun Papers in the Spalding Club Miscellany, vol. iv.; Hist. MSS. Commission, 5th Rep. pt. i. App. 633–44; Wodrow's Biog. Collections on the Lives of Reformers, Maitland Club Miscellany, vol. i.; Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, vol. iii.; James Melville's Diary; Richard Bannatyne's Memoriales; Diurnal of Occurrents; Knox's Works; Histories of Calderwood, Spotiswood, and Keith; M'Crie's Lives of Knox and of Melville.] T. F. H.

ERSKINE, JOHN, second or seventh Earl of Mar in the Erskine line (1558–1634), lord high treasurer of Scotland, only son of John, first or sixth earl of Mar [q. v.], regent of Scotland, and Annabella, daughter of Sir William Murray of Tullibardine, was born in 1558. He was educated at Stirling Castle in company with King James, who was seven years his junior, under George Buchanan. King James called him familiarly 'Jocky o' Sclaittis' (slates). On 3 March 1572–3 he was served heir of his father 'in toto et integro comitatu de Mar,' his uncle, Sir Alexander Erskine of Gogar, being appointed guardian of his estate and keeper of Stirling Castle during his minority. Soon after he came of age he was persuaded by the Earl of Morton, then in forced retirement at Lochleven, to assert his claim to the government of Stirling Castle and the guardianship of the king. Morton agreed to support his claim on condition that he should permit Morton to resume his ascendency over the king. He returned to Stirling Castle, and early on the morning of 26 April 1578 called for the keys of the castle, on the pretence that he intended to hunt. His uncle, bringing the keys, was immediately seized by the young earl's confederates and pushed unceremoniously outside the gates. Those of the lords opposed to Morton who were at Edinburgh rode in great haste to Stirling to prevent if possible any further development of the supposed plot, but Mar politely declined to permit more than one of them to enter the castle at one time. They were therefore constrained to agree that Mar should be left in charge of the king till the meeting of parliament, he undertaking to find four earls as cautioners for his fidelity (Calderwood, *Hist.* iii. 408). Soon afterwards Morton obtained admission to the castle, and made arrangements for the perpetuation of his own influence. At a convention of the nobility favourable to Morton, held at Stirling, it was agreed to change the place of meeting of the ensuing parliament from Edinburgh to Stirling. The lords of the 'secret council' also issued from Stirling on 6 July a proclamation concerning certain sinister rumours in regard to their purposes in the approaching parliament, and especially a denial of the rumour that the king was detained at Stirling against his will (*Reg. Privy Council of Scotland*, iii. 3–4). At the opening of the parliament on 15 July Mar bore the sword, and was nominally confirmed in his guardianship of the castle and the king, but it was agreed that four of the new council should always be in attendance on the king (Calderwood, iii. 417). The lords of the opposite faction then assembled a force to

make good their demands that Morton should retire to his 'own dwelling-place,' and that the king should be delivered to Alexander Erskine to be kept in the castle of Edinburgh (*ib.* 419), but through the interposition of Bowes, the English ambassador, an agreement was arrived at, signed by the young King James on 15 Aug., to the effect that Mar should remain in charge of the king at Stirling, a section of the rival faction being, however, added to the council (*ib.* 425). On 5 March 1578–9 it was re-enacted by the council that none should repair armed within the castle of Stirling while the king was there, Mar being authorised to apprehend all such persons (*Reg. Privy Council Scot.* iii. 105). On the 16th an act was passed exonerating him and his family for their care of the king in the past, and making arrangements for attendance on the king during excursions (*ib.* 112–14). In April Mar gave a banquet to the king and nobility in token of general reconciliation (*Historie of James Sext*, 174), but the effect of it was sadly frustrated by the sudden death of Atholl after his return from the banquet, the general suspicion arising that he had died from poison. In view of the approaching departure of the king from Stirling Castle, Mar, on 8 Aug. 1579, received an attestation that he and his family had in all points performed their duty in his tutelage and in the keeping of the castle (*ib.* 200). With other nobles he accompanied the king in his journey from Stirling to Holyrood on 29 and 30 Sept. (Calderwood, iii. 457). In April 1580, word having been brought to the king while on a hunting expedition that Morton intended to carry him to Dalkeith, he galloped back to Stirling Castle (Arrington to Burghley, 4 April 1580). Shortly after his return thither Mar was informed of a plot of Lennox, to which Sir Alexander Erskine was affirmed to be privy, to invade the royal apartments and carry off the king to Dumbarton. The 10th of April was said to be the night fixed on, but Mar stationed soldiers without and within the royal apartments, and in the morning refused admittance to the suspected nobles (Arrington to Burghley, 16 April 1580). Mar, having been supposed to be concerned in the former plot, presented on 20 April a supplication to the council, protesting that he had never persuaded or pressed the king in regard to residence or anything else beyond his own goodwill, but had always besought him to follow the advice of his council, and more particularly that his removing to Edinburgh and retiring from Edinburgh 'was by advice of his counsale and na instigation of the earl or his.' To the truth of this declaration James testified 'in the faith and word of a king,' and it was confirmed by an act of the council (*Reg.* iii. 282). Mar remained true to Morton in the midst of the intrigues by which his influence was now threatened, and, after Morton's sudden apprehension on the charge of being concerned in Darnley's murder, assisted the Earl of Angus in arranging with Randolph, the English ambassador, a plot against Lennox. The hesitating attitude of Elizabeth when the time for action arrived induced Mar to abandon it, and to come to an understanding with Lennox (see narrative of Randolph's negotiation in Scotland, printed in appendix to Tytler's *Hist. of Scot.*) On this account, as well as probably also from the respect entertained for him by the king, he escaped the sentence of forfeiture passed against the other nobles who had supported Morton, but nevertheless Lennox refused any alliance with him, and he was excluded from the counsels of the king. In August 1582 a rumour, whether true or false, arose that Lennox intended to commit to ward Mar and other protestant lords, and 'also afterwards to hasten the death of the principals of them, on the charge of a conspiracy against the king and himself' (Bowes to Walsingham, 15 Aug. 1582, in Bowes, *Correspondence*, 177). The rumour hastened if it did not occasion the execution of the conspiracy. By the 'raid of Ruthven' on 15 Aug. Mar, Gowrie, and others, either through force or persuasion, brought the king from Perth to Ruthven Castle, and removed him from the influence of Lennox and Arran. Learning that Arran, who was at Kinneil, intended to attempt the rescue of the king, Mar, with sixty horse, set out to intercept him at Kinross (Moysie, *Memoirs*, 37; Calderwood, iii. 637). Arran sent the bulk of his men under the command of his brother, Colonel William Stewart, and with the utmost haste, accompanied by only two attendants, proceeded by a near route to Ruthven, but his followers were attacked from an ambush by Mar and Sir William Douglas and completely routed, while Arran, as soon as he arrived at Ruthven to demand an audience of the king, was apprehended. On 30 Aug. the king was brought from Perth to Mar's castle at Stirling, having previously been induced to make a declaration that he was not being held in captivity (Calderwood, iii. 640). About the same time the protestant noblemen subscribed a bond to 'remain with his majesty until the abuses and enormities of the commonwealth should be redressed' (*ib.* 645). On 19 Oct., at a convention of estates held at Holyrood in presence of the king, the 'raid of Ruthven' was declared to be 'gude, aufauld, trew,

thankfull, and necessar service to his Hienes,' and complete exoneration was given by name to the Earl of Mar, the Earl of Gowrie, and the Earl of Glencairn (*Reg. Privy Council of Scotland*, iii. 519). On 20 May the king, attended by the Earl of Mar and others, set out on a 'progress,' and while at Falkland he, with the aid of Colonel Stewart, withdrew suddenly to St. Andrews, and took refuge in the castle. The Duke of Lennox having died in the previous month, Arran now regulated alone the counsels of the king. On 22 Aug. Mar arrived at court, and through the mediation of Argyll was at first favourably received (Bowes, *Correspondence*, Surtees Society, p. 560). Argyll was, however, unsuccessful in reconciling him with Arran, and on the 27th he was committed to the custody of Argyll till he should leave the country (Calderwood, iii. 724). Having been persuaded by Argyll to deliver up Stirling Castle, he retired with him into Argyllshire (Bowes, *Correspondence*, 568). The keeping of the castle was then given by the king to Arran, who was also appointed provost of Stirling (Calderwood, iii. 731). Mar hoped that the storm would blow over, but in the beginning of September he was warned to depart also from Argyll (Bowes, 577), and on 31 Jan. 1583–4 he was banished from England, Scotland, and Ireland on pain of treason (*Reg. Privy Council Scot.* iii. 626). Either before or immediately after this he had crossed over to Ireland (Calderwood, iv. 21), and Angus O'Neill was charged to make him and the Master of Glammis depart from Carrickfergus (*ib.* 24). O'Neill declined, and shortly afterwards Mar was in Scotland endeavouring with other protestant lords to put into execution a new conspiracy. Whispers of the plot having reached Arran, all persons, servants, dependents, or tenants of Mar were on 29 March commanded to leave Edinburgh within three hours (*Reg. Privy Council Scot.* iii. 644; Calderwood, iv. 20). It was not, however, at Edinburgh that Mar designed to strike. In these plots and counterplots a form of legality was always observed, and Mar therefore determined to begin by capturing the castle of Stirling, to which his legal claims were more than plausible. This he effected on 17 April (Calderwood, iv. 25). Stirling was to have been made the rendezvous of the protestant nobles, but on 13 April Gowrie was captured by Colonel Stewart at Dundee. Mar therefore, on the approach of the king against Stirling with a large force, left the castle in haste and again fled the country (Sir James Melville, *Memoirs*, 326; Calderwood, vi. 32). Thereupon a proclamation was made for the capture of him and his confederates dead or alive (*Reg. Privy Council Scot.* iii. 659), but they made their way across the border to Berwick (*Cal. State Papers*, Scot. Ser. i. 470). There they received a letter from Walsingham, informing them of Elizabeth's intention to provide for their safety and to use the best means she could for their restoration to the king's favour (*ib.*) James endeavoured to persuade her to deliver them up, but she soundly rated him for having such dangerous and wicked instruments as Arran about him (*ib.* 472). Having arrived at Newcastle, Angus, Mar, and Glammis drew up instructions to Colvile to lay their case before the queen (*ib.* 473), and Elizabeth sent William Davison to Edinburgh on a special embassy on their behalf (*ib.*), who, however, found James vehemently opposed to come to any agreement with them. At the meeting of parliament in August both Mar and his countess, Agnes Drummond, were forfaulted (Calderwood, iv. 198). Thereafter Elizabeth opened negotiations with Arran, whose professions of goodwill so far prevailed as to make her discourage a proposed enterprise of the exiled lords against his authority. Accordingly on 22 Dec. 1584 she informed them that she had consented to the king of Scotland's request for their removal from the frontiers of the kingdom (*Cal. State Papers*, Scot. Ser. i. 491). After disobeying her repeated expostulations, they at last, on 2 Feb., reluctantly intimated compliance, and removing from Newcastle proceeded southwards. At Norwich they learned that an accusation had been made against them of being concerned in a conspiracy against the king's person (*ib.* 494), whereupon they wrote on 10 March asking to be sent for to be tried immediately before the council. Elizabeth, anxious at this time for a stricter league with James, instructed her ambassador to advise the king that Angus, Mar, and Glammis might be tried for their alleged conspiracy against his person by a parliament freely chosen (*ib.* 494). On 4 May she, however, in reply to the ambassador, requesting delivery of them, expressed her conviction of their innocence (*ib.* 495), and on the 12th she sent Sir Philip Sydney to visit them at their lodgings at Westminster, 'to assure them of her good affection' (Calderwood, iv. 366). At last, finding that her attempts to 'disgrace' Arran with the king were vain, and that her negotiations for a league were making no real progress, she was induced to act on the advice of Edward Wotton to Walsingham (25 Aug. 1585, *Cal. State Papers*, Scot. Ser. i. 506), 'to stay the league and let slip the lords, who will be able to take Arran and seize on the person of the king.'

Encouraged by Walsingham, Mar and the lords therefore made up their differences with the Hamiltons, and agreed on a joint invasion of Scotland. Towards the end of October, with Elizabeth's permission, they took their departure from Westminster, after 'a verie earnest exercise of humiliation' (Calderwood, iv. 381). On 1 Nov., having received, after entering Scotland, large accessions of nobles, barons, and gentlemen, with their dependents, they pitched their tents at St. Ninian's Chapel, within a mile of Stirling, their total forces numbering about ten thousand (*ib.* 389). On learning their approach, Arran immediately fled from the castle, and the king, after making preparations for resistance, on second thoughts came to terms with them, and on their entrance gave them a cordial welcome (*ib.* 392). The castle was then restored to Mar, who by act of parliament, 10 Dec. 1585, was declared a member of the privy council, his honours and estates being also restored. By the general assembly of 1588 he was appointed one of a commission to induce the king to devise methods for 'purging the land of papists' (*ib.* 650). He was one of the nobles who received the king on his arrival with Queen Anne from Denmark, the Countess of Mar holding the first place among the ladies appointed to receive the queen (*ib.* v. 61). For some time Mar, with Sir William Douglas of Lochleven, afterwards Earl of Morton, and the prior of Blantyre exercised the chief influence at court (*ib.* 149), Mar being made great master of the household. After the forfailture of Bothwell, in the beginning of March, he was also made governor of Edinburgh Castle (*ib.* 166). As a mark of his special favour, James arranged a marriage between Mar and Lady Mary Stewart, second daughter of the Duke of Lennox, and in 1592 he paid a visit to him and his young wife at Alloa (*Historie of James Sext*, p. 260). For a time also Mar belonged to the faction specially favoured by the queen; but when, in 1595, she wished the removal of the young Prince Henry, who was under the charge of the Dowager Countess of Mar (Birch, *Life of Prince Henry*, p. 7), from Stirling to Edinburgh Castle, to be under the charge of Buccleuch, Mar declined to accede to her request (Calderwood, v. 366). His refusal was approved of by the king, who on 24 July specially entrusted the prince to Mar's tuition by a warrant under his own hand. When the king, 9 Feb. 1596–7, was besieged by a protestant mob in the Upper Tolbooth, he sent for the assistance of Mar, who, partly by remonstrances and partly by promises, sufficiently quieted the agitation to enable the king to proceed to Holyrood. At a convention at Holyrood, 10 Dec. 1598, Mar was chosen one of the special privy councillors appointed to sit with the king twice a week and aid him with their advice (*ib.* 727). He was in the train of the king in Falkland Park on the day of the mysterious Gowrie conspiracy, 5 Aug. 1600, and, following at a distance, arrived in time to prevent its success (see 'Discourse,' printed by order of the king, reprinted in Calderwood, vi. 28–45). Essex, in connection with his rebellion, asked King James to send up Mar, ostensibly as ambassador to Elizabeth, but so as to assist him in his design. James consented, but Mar only arrived in London in the beginning of March, after Essex's execution. The instructions given him by James after the execution proceeded on the supposition that a rebellion against Elizabeth was a not impossible occurrence (see 'Instructions' printed in *Cecil Correspondence*, Camden Society, 1861, pp. 82–84); but Mar, having better information, undertook the responsibility of disregarding them. He conducted his negotiations with such skill as to be entirely successful in the object of his mission, Elizabeth at last 'manifesting her mynd to him that the king sould be hir infallible successor' (*Historie of James Sext*, 377), and he left the impression of being 'a courtly and well-advised gentleman' (see *State Papers*, Dom. Ser. 1601–3, p. 45). The success of this mission was gratefully acknowledged by James both in words and in continued confidence and favours. Mar was one of the nobles who accompanied the king from Edinburgh, 5 April 1603, to take possession of the throne of England (Nichols, *Progresses of James I*, i. 61), but returned after he arrived at York, on the news reaching him that the queen had gone to Stirling to bring the young prince to England. His instructions were to bring the queen with him, but she refused to travel without the prince, and, after further communications with the king, the Duke of Lennox was sent with a commission on 19 May to transport both the queen and the prince, Mar not being included among the noblemen who were to attend on her (Calderwood, vi. 231). Mar and the queen were, however, reconciled after her arrival at Windsor (Birch, *Life of Prince Henry*, p. 30). Mar was added to the English privy council, and in June 1603 received the order of the Garter. On 27 March 1604 he was created Lord Cardross, obtaining at the same time the barony of that name, with the power of assigning the barony and title to any of his heirs male, the purpose of this being, as stated in the grant, that he 'might be in a better condition to provide for his

younger sons by Lady Mary Stewart.' In 1606 he returned to Scotland to assist at the trial of John Welsh and five other ministers on a charge of treason. He was appointed a member of the court of high commission, erected in 1610 for the trial of ecclesiastical offences (CALDERWOOD, vii. 58). On the fall of the Earl of Somerset, Mar was in December 1616 appointed lord high treasurer of Scotland,[1] an office which he held till 1630. He died in his own house at Stirling 14 Dec. 1634, and was buried at Alloa 7 April 1635. Mar devoted himself as far as possible to recover the heritage of his family, under the warrant to his father, 5 May 1565. A narrative of the various lawsuits connected therewith, especially the great process for the recovery of Kildrummie from the Elphinstones, 1624–6, is given in Crawford's 'Earldom of Mar.' He was twice married: first to Anna, second daughter of David, second lord Drummond, by whom he had a son John, who succeeded him in the earldom; and secondly to Lady Mary Stewart, second daughter of Esme, duke of Lennox, by whom he had five sons and four daughters. The eldest of these sons, Sir James Erskine, married Mary Douglas, countess of Buchan in her own right, and was created Earl of Buchan [see ERSKINE, JAMES, sixth EARL OF BUCHAN]. The second, Henry, received from his father the barony of Cardross, and was known as the first Lord Cardross. The third, Colonel the Hon. Sir Alexander Erskine, the hero of the old Scotch ballad 'Baloo, my boy,' was blown up at Dunglas House, East Lothian, in 1640. The fourth, Hon. Sir Charles Erskine, was the ancestor of the Erskines of Alva, now represented by the Earls of Rosslyn. The youngest, William Erskine (*d.* 1685) [q. v.], became cupbearer to Charles II and master of the Charterhouse, London. All the four daughters were married to earls, viz. Mary, to William, earl Marischal, and again to Patrick, earl of Panmure; Anne, to John, earl of Rothes; Martha, to John, earl of Kinghorn; and Catherine, to Thomas, earl of Haddington, who was blown up at Dunglas House along with her brother Alexander. This Earl of Mar built the castle of Braemar in 1628 (*Hist. MSS. Comm.* 5th Rep. 618).

[Register of the Privy Council of Scotland; State Papers, Reign of Elizabeth and James I; Calderwood's History of the Kirk of Scotland; Moysie's Memoirs (Bannatyne Club); Historie of James Sext (ib.); Gray Papers (ib.); Sir James Melville's Memoirs (ib.); Letters and State Papers during Reign of James VI (Abbotsford Club); Miscellaneous Papers relating to Mary Queen of Scots and James VI (Maitland Club); Bowes's Correspondence (Surtees Society); Cecil Correspondence (Camd. Society); Nichols's Progresses of James I; Birch's Life of Prince Henry; Secret History of James I; Spotiswood's History of the Kirk of Scotland; Douglas's Scottish Peerage (Wood), ii. 213–14; Craufurd's Officers of State, pp. 402–4; the Earl of Crawford's Earldom of Mar in Sunshine and Shade (1882); the histories of Tytler, Hill Burton, and Froude.] T. F. H.

ERSKINE, JOHN, sixth or eleventh EARL OF MAR of the Erskine line (1675–1732), leader of the rebellion of 1715 in behalf of the Pretender, eldest son of Charles, tenth earl of Mar, by his wife, Lady Mary Maule, daughter of the Earl of Panmure, was born at Alloa in February 1675. On account of the fines and sequestrations to which his grandfather had been subjected the eleventh Earl of Mar, on succeeding his father in 1689, found, in the words of the Master of Sinclair, that he had been left heir to 'more debt than estate' (*Memoirs*, 59), and according to the same authority his endowments from his mother were of an equally questionable sort, the most noteworthy being the 'hump he has got on his back, and his dissolute, malicious, meddling spirit' (*ib.*) It was almost in the character of a needy suppliant that he joined himself to the Duke of Queensberry and the court party, whose goodwill he deemed it advisable to secure, in view of his questionable proceedings towards his creditors. He took his oaths and seat on 8 Sept. 1696, and on 1 April following was sworn a privy councillor. Subsequently he was appointed to the command of a regiment of foot, and was invested with the order of the Thistle. He remained a devoted adherent of the court party till the fall of the Duke of Queensberry in 1704, after which he joined in opposing the tactics of the squadrone party, of which the Marquis of Tweeddale was the head, doing so, according to Lockhart, 'with so much art and dissimulation that he gained the favour of all the tories, and was by many of them esteemed an honest man, and well inclined to the royal family' (*Papers*, i. 114). With the return of the Duke of Queensberry to power in 1705 the tactics of Mar again underwent a change, and determining at least to postpone any purposes he might have cherished of advancing the cause of the Stuarts, he became, as before, one of the most exemplary supporters of the court party. Of his willingness to promote the policy of Queensberry he gave a sufficient pledge by undertaking to bring forward the motion for an act for the treaty of a union between Scotland and England in the parliament of this year, and he was constituted one of the commissioners for that purpose. In reward for such important services he was, after the prorogation of

parliament, appointed secretary of state for Scotland, in the room of the Marquis of Annandale, who had manifested a decided lukewarmness towards the proposal. As this office was abolished when effect was given to the act of union, Mar was then appointed keeper of the signet, a pension being also assigned him. He was chosen, 13 Feb. 1707, one of the sixteen representative peers of Scotland, and was re-elected in 1708, 1710, and 1713. In 1708 he was also named a privy councillor. Notwithstanding his efforts in bringing about the union, he, from motives not it is probable entirely patriotic, spoke strongly in favour of the motion of Lord Findlater in 1713 for its repeal. The fact that in 1713 he married as his second wife Lady Frances Pierrepoint, second daughter of the Duke of Kingston, and sister of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, has been regarded as an evidence of his desire to strengthen his position with the whigs; but as on 13 Sept. of this year he accepted the office of secretary of state under the tories, his marriage cannot be taken as indicating more than that he was ready to go over to the whigs should it again fall to their lot to be in power. It cannot be doubted that with the tories he looked forward to the death of Anne as affording an opportunity for the reinstatement of the exiled dynasty; but these designs being baffled by the prompt action of Argyll and Somerset, Mar gracefully bowed to the inevitable, and resolved to place himself as entirely at the service of King George as if no thoughts of another successor to the throne had ever crossed his mind. He wrote a letter to the king, dated 30 Aug., in which, after recounting the services rendered not only by himself to the protestant succession, but by his ancestors to the ancestors of King George 'for a great tract of years,' he added, 'your majesty shall ever find me as faithful and dutiful a subject and servant as ever any of my family have been to the crown, or as I have been to my late mistress the queen' (Letter, printed with *Some Remarks on my Lord's subsequent conduct*, by Richard Steele, 1715, and frequently reprinted). In addition to sending to the king this vauntingly loyal offer of his services Mar made it known that he had received a document signed by a large number of the most powerful highland chiefs, in which they desired him to assure the government of 'their loyalty to his sacred majesty King George.' Lockhart of Carnwath, who had abundant opportunities of knowing Mar, states that his 'great talent lay in the cunning management of his designs and projects, in which it was hard to find him out when he desired to be *incognito*; and thus he showed himself to be a man of good sense but bad morals' (*Papers*, i. 114). He was dismissed from office on 24 Sept., but he played the part of the fawning courtier to the very last, and attended a levee at court the evening before his departure to Scotland to place himself at the head of the movement in behalf of the chevalier. After leaving the court on the evening of 1 Aug. he changed his dress, and in the character of a common workman went on board a ship at Gravesend belonging to John Spence, a Leith skipper, and after a passage of about five days landed at Elie in Fife (Deposition of the Earl of Mar's valet, in *Original Letters*, p. 17). The Master of Sinclair states that he had information of the earl's landing the day afterwards from the Master of Grange (*Memoirs*, 19). From Elie Mar went to the house of Bethune of Balfour, near Markinch (*ib.*), where a meeting was held of the friends of the cause. On 17 Aug. he passed the Tay with forty horse, and, on his journey northwards to his fortalice at Kildrummy in the Braes of Mar, issued an invitation to those noblemen and chiefs on whom he could rely to attend a meeting on the 27th at Aboyne, ostensibly for the sport of hunting the deer in accordance with a custom 'among the lords and chiefs of families in the highlands' (Patten). Those who responded to the invitation numbered about eight hundred, representing, with the exception of Argyll, the most influential nobles of the highlands, as well as several lowland nobles and gentlemen. The meeting was addressed by Mar in a speech the cleverness of which is sufficiently attested by its entire success. He frankly confessed that he had committed a great blunder in supporting the union, but stated that his eyes were now open to the fact that by it their 'ancient liberties were delivered up into the hands of the English, whose power to enslave them further was too great, and their design to do it daily visible' (Patten). By the warlike clans his proposal was received with acclamation, and, after a more private meeting held on 3 Sept., arrangements were completed for putting the design into immediate execution. Having set up the standard of the chevalier on 6 Sept. at Braemar, on a rocky eminence overlooking the Cluny, and proclaimed James VIII king of Scotland, England, France, and Ireland, Mar began his march southwards. On the 9th he issued a declaration, in which he announced that the chevalier had 'been pleased to instruct me with the direction of his affairs and the command of the forces in this his ancient kingdom of Scotland' (*Collection of Original Letters*, p. 15). Accompanied by some neigh-

bouring chiefs and their followers, he proceeded by the Spittal of Glenshie to Kirkmichael, the other chiefs meanwhile having separated to raise their followers. It would appear that among the persons least disposed to risk themselves in an enterprise under the leadership of Mar were his own tenants and dependents, for in a letter on 9 Sept. to John Forbes, his bailie at Kildrummy, he thus bluntly addresses him: 'Jocke,—Ye was in the right not to come with the 100 men ye sent up to Night, when I expected four times the Number,' and he goes on to threaten that 'if they come not forth with their best arms' he will, 'by all that's sacred,' burn everything that cannot be carried away, let his 'own loss be what it will, that it may be an example to others' (published separately, republished in *Somers Tracts*, iv. 429, and in Patten). After remaining four or five days at Kirkmichael to wait for reinforcements, Mar resumed his southward movement, and when he reached Dunkeld his forces numbered as many as two thousand (Patten). With these he advanced to Perth, which, in accordance with his instructions, had been seized on 16 Sept. by a party of two hundred horse under the command of John Hay, brother of the Earl of Kinnoul, who had thus succeeded in frustrating a similar design on the part of the Earl of Rothes in behalf of King George. Perth was now made the headquarters of the rebels, while Stirling became the rendezvous of the supporters of the government. Perth was the key to the north, just as Stirling was the key to the south. While Stirling remained in the hands of Argyll there was a barrier between Mar and the friends of the chevalier in the south. Mar therefore hit upon the expedient of sending a strong detachment across the Firth of Forth from Fife to make a dash at Edinburgh. The plan was so recklessly rash that its success could only have been momentary, but it was nipped in the bud by the rapid ride of Argyll from Stirling with five hundred troops; and the rebels, after various uncertain movements, passed into England to share in the disaster at Preston. In concert with the movement from Fife, Mar made a feint of marching southwards to dispute the passage at Stirling; but though this caused the hasty return of Argyll thither, he had already frustrated the attempt on Edinburgh. On learning that Argyll had returned, Mar, after retreating to Auchterarder, again fell back on Perth, where he remained for some time to levy money and afford opportunity for his forces to collect. While at Perth, besides sending a circular on 3 Oct. to the friends of the cause inviting them to advance certain sums on loan, the amount of which he took care definitely to fix, he issued a series of orders for the collection of a land cess, as well as contributions from the principal burghs. By these expedients he was able, as he complacently announced to one of his officers, to place his forces 'on a regular foot of pay at threeepence a day and three loaves, which is full as good as the pay of the soldiers at Stirling.' The time spent by Mar in these elaborate preparations may be said to have sealed the fate of his enterprise. On 6 Oct. Mar received despatches from France, and also a new commission from the chevalier, given at the court of Bar-le-Duc, 7 Sept., appointing him 'our general and commander-in-chief of all our forces, both by sea and land, in our ancient kingdom of Scotland.' It was not, however, till 10 Nov. that he broke up his camp at Perth and marched to Auchterarder, where he was joined by the western clans who had been foiled by the Earl of Islay in their attempt on Inverary. After holding a review, he with characteristic infatuation rested on the following day, and it was not till the 12th that he began his march towards Dunblane, his main division being sent forward to take possession of the town, while he intended, in leisurely fashion, to remain with the rear at Ardoch. Hardly had the march begun, however, when he learned that Argyll had already anticipated him by taking possession of the town. A halt was therefore immediately called, and on the arrival of Mar it was decided that the whole army should concentrate at Kinbuck, where they passed the night under arms. On Sunday morning, 13 Nov., they formed on Sheriffmuir, to the left of the road leading to Dunblane, in full view of Argyll and his staff, whose troops had now advanced beyond Dunblane, but, owing to the configuration of the ground, were partially concealed from Mar and his officers. The forces of Mar numbered about twelve thousand to the four thousand under Argyll; and Mar's chance of victory was completely thrown away through the entire absence of common precaution, or even any definite arrangements. He called a council to debate the expediency of risking a battle. The ardent shouts of the chiefs for an instant attack drowned a few faint murmurs for delay. Mar's previous hesitation became transformed into headlong rashness. In fact in the battle of Sheriffmuir Mar cannot be said to have discharged any of the functions of a general; he merely headed an attack in haphazard fashion by a brave and powerful force formed of detachments under separate chiefs, against thoroughly disciplined troops. The right wing of the highland

army outflanked the left of Argyll's forces, and drove them in headlong flight to Dunblane, but the left was in turn outflanked, and the attack being met with a steady fire of musketry, the highlanders before coming to close quarters wavered and faltered, whereupon Argyll, not permitting them to reform, charged them opportunely with his cavalry, chasing them for a mile and a half over the river Allan. The other portion of Mar's troops were almost as completely disorganised by victory as their comrades were by defeat, and on their return from the pursuit, though flushed with triumph, showed no disposition to renew the conflict. Argyll and Wightman, having chased the rebel left from the field, now found behind them the victorious right posted inactively on the top of the hill of Kippendavie, but, as Wightman explains (Wightman's account of the battle in PATTEN), they resolved to put the best face on the matter, and marched straight to the enemy in line of battle. The ruse was quite successful, for Mar kept his 'front towards the enemy to the north of us, who seemed at first as if they intended to march towards us' (account by Mar in PATTEN). When the troops of Argyll, after coming within half a mile of the enemy, inclined to their left towards Dunblane, 'the enemy,' says Wightman, with quiet sarcasm, 'behaved like civil gentlemen, and let us do what we pleased, so that we passed the Bridge of Dunblain, posted ourselves very securely, and lay on our arms all night.' Mar withdrew to Ardoch, 'whither,' he complacently remarked, 'we marched in very good order.' He then fell back on Auchterarder, and as the highlanders began to disperse, the retreat was continued to Perth. By striking coincidences the day of Sheriffmuir saw also the capture of the town and castle of Inverness and the defeat at Preston. Mar now began to sound Argyll as to what terms he would be prepared to make. Argyll was not, however, empowered to treat, and when he made application to the government for an enlargement of his commission no answer was returned. Soon afterwards, on 22 Dec., the chevalier landed at Peterhead, and Mar having met him at Feteresso, and been created duke, accompanied him to the historical village of Scone, whence the chevalier issued several royal proclamations, one of which appointed his coronation to take place on 23 Jan. Mar also sent forth an address in which he described the prince 'as really the finest gentleman I ever knew,' and asserted that to have 'him peaceably settled on his throne is what these kingdoms do not deserve; but he deserves it so much that I hope there is a good fate attending him' (PATTEN, p. 76). To delay the march of Argyll northwards, orders were given by Mar on 17 Jan. in name of the king to burn Auchterarder and the other villages in his line of march, and also all corn and forage lest they might be 'useful to the enemy.' Such cruel expedients might have been justifiable in a great extremity, but Mar was now merely clutching at straws, without the least hope of being ultimately successful. Even a month before the chevalier landed he had resolved, he states in his 'Journal,' to abandon Perth as soon as the enemy marched against it. The orders for the devastation were carried out in the midst of a snowstorm, the cries of the women and children drawing tears from the eyes 'even of the barbarous highlanders' (accounts of the burning of the villages Auchterarder, Muthill, &c., in *Miscellany of the Maitland Club*, iii. 461). The highland chiefs, on learning of Argyll's approach, made every effort to persuade Mar to risk a battle, but in fact many days before this he had made arrangements for retreat and escape as soon as the advance of Argyll should furnish him with an excuse for doing so. When Argyll was at Tullibardine, eight miles from Perth, the city was abandoned by the rebels, the bulk of whom had crossed the Tay on the ice by ten o'clock on the morning of 31 Jan., Mar and the chevalier following in the rear about noon. The retreat, it must be admitted, was conducted with skill as well as expedition. So rapid was it that when Montrose was reached, Argyll was two days' march behind them. On the evening that they arrived there orders were given to the clans to be ready to march at eight in the morning to Aberdeen, where they were told reinforcements were expected to arrive immediately from France; but before the march began the chevalier had slipped privately out of the house where he lodged, and joined the Earl of Mar, who accompanied him by a bye-lane to the waterside, where a boat waited to convey them on board a French ship. They were subsequently joined by other leaders, and on 11 Feb. they were landed at Walden, near Gravelines. The clans meanwhile, after reaching Aberdeen under General Gordon, dispersed to their homes.

Mar accompanied the prince to St. Germain, where he busied himself with a variety of intrigues, the chief purpose of which was rather to obtain his own restoration than that of the Stuart family. One of these schemes was to secure the assistance of Charles XII of Sweden, whose favour he recommended the Jacobites in Scotland to procure by a present of oatmeal for his troops. Mar next, through Lockhart, made proposals to his late opponent Argyll, when he supposed the latter to be still

writhing with resentment at his dismissal in June 1716 from all his offices; but the overtures met with no encouragement. In the following year he entered into communications with Sunderland, offering the assistance of France to George I, to enlarge his German dominions, on condition of his assenting in some form to a Stuart restoration. There is some evidence that George I was not altogether averse to the project, but its inherent absurdity was no doubt at once evident to his advisers. In connection with the project Mar had also had communications with the Earl of Stair, with whom he had formerly been on terms of special intimacy. As he then admitted to Stair that he regarded the affairs of his master as 'desperate,' his negotiations would seem to have been entered into rather with the view of commending himself to King George than of aiding the cause of the chevalier. Shortly afterwards he left Paris for Italy, and he had no further communications with Stair till on the return journey in 1719 he stopped at Geneva. On this occasion he openly expressed his anxiety to desert the cause of the chevalier and come to terms with the government (see the documents connected with the negotiation in *Hardwicke State Papers*, vol. ii.) Stair advanced him a sum of money, and advised that he should be conciliated on the ground that to detach him would 'break the prince's party.' Mar's terms for consenting to abstain from any plot against the government were that the family estates should be settled on his son, and that meanwhile until this was done he should be paid a pension of 2,000*l.*, in addition to 1,500*l.* of a jointure to his wife and daughter. It would appear that the Jacobites at St. Germain were quite aware of his negotiations with Stair, but he informed them that he had no intention of fulfilling the conditions, while by pretending to do so he would be able more effectually to aid the cause. It was at Mar's suggestion that the chevalier stirred up the scheme of Atterbury, bishop of Rochester [q. v.], and he appears to have done so simply to demonstrate to the government his willingness to save them by discovering the plot. Not improbably it was through his connivance that his own correspondence with Atterbury was intercepted (see letters in Appendix to *Stuart Papers*), and at any rate it is almost demonstrable that he was the person who supplied the means of deciphering it. Shortly afterwards, in 1723, he presented a memorial to the regent of France, expounding a project for betraying Britain into the power of France, by dismembering the British empire through an adjustment of the powers of the Scottish and Irish parliaments. His real design in making the proposal was supposed to have been to render the cause of the Jacobites odious to the people of Britain by connecting them with an unpatriotic scheme. Atterbury, after his arrival in France, obtained evidence sufficient to convince him that Mar had been guilty of 'such base practices' 'that the like had scarce been heard of; and seemed to be what no man endued with common sense or the least drop of noble blood could perpetrate' (*Lockhart Papers*, ii. 142). Atterbury also expressed the general opinion which ultimately prevailed among the Jacobites regarding Mar, that 'it was impossible for him ever to play a fair game or to mean but one thing at once' (*Stuart Papers*, 131). Latterly all his proposals bore on the face of them the marks of charlatanry, and he ceased to possess the power to deceive any one but himself. He prepared a justification of his conduct, of which an abstract is given in 'Lockhart Papers' (ii. 175–9), but he failed to convince any one either of his good sense or his sincerity. The prince, however, in a letter to Lockhart expressed his desire that the facts proven against him should rather be concealed than made public, and gave it as his opinion that the 'less noise made about him the better' (*ib.* 198). He was succeeded in the confidence of the prince in 1724 by Colonel Hay, and in 1725 he definitely severed his connection with the Stuarts without, however, thereby securing any benefit from the government. In his retirement he accepted his disappointment more philosophically than could have been predicted, occupying himself chiefly in architectural designs and drawings. In a paper written in 1728 he suggested the improvement of the communications in Edinburgh by proposing the building of bridges north and south of the city. He also suggested the formation of a navigable canal between the Forth and Clyde. He resided in Paris till 1729, when, on account of his health, he removed to Aix-la-Chapelle, where he died in May 1732. He was twice married; first to Lady Margaret, daughter of the Earl of Kinnoul, by whom he had two sons, the youngest of whom died in infancy, and the eldest, Thomas, lord Erskine, became commissary of stores for Gibraltar, and afterwards sat in parliament successively for the counties of Stirling and Clackmannan; and secondly to Lady Frances Pierrepoint, by whom he had a daughter, Lady Frances, married to her cousin, James Erskine, son of Lord Grange. The second Lady Mar suffered latterly from mental irregularity, and having, like his own wife, quarrelled with Lord Grange [see Erskine, James], Grange

formed a scheme to carry her off somewhat similar to that which led to the disappearance of Lady Grange, but in this case he was frustrated by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. The Mar estates were purchased for Thomas, lord Erskine, by Lord Grange. On account of the favour which Gibbs, the architect, received from the Earl of Mar, he left the bulk of his money to Mar's children. The attainder of the earldom of Mar was reversed in 1824. On the failure of male issue in 1866, the earldom, as created in 1565 limited to heirs male, was, after a prolonged argument before the House of Lords, declared on 25 Feb. 1875, to belong to Walter Henry Erskine, earl of Kellie, a decision which nullified the claims put forth for the earldom to be the oldest in the kingdom; but on 6 Aug. 1885 the title of Earl of Mar with original precedence as descended from Gratney, earl of Mar (1294), was confirmed to John Francis Erskine Goodeve Erskine, who had married Lady Frances Jemima Erskine, the nearest female heir in the failure in 1866 of male issue.

[Journal of the Earl of Mar, printed by order of the Earl of Mar, in France, republished at London, 1716, and frequently reprinted; A Collection of Original Letters and Authentick Papers relating to the Rebellion of 1715, London, 1730; A Full and Authentick Narrative of the Intended Horrid Conspiracy and Invasion, London, 1715; Patten's History of the Rebellion of 1715; Sinclair Memoirs; Lockhart Papers; Stuart Papers; Hardwicke State Papers; Macpherson's Original Papers; Secret Memoirs of Bar-le-Duc, 1716; Macky's Secret Memoirs; Swift's Works; Jesse's Pretenders and their Adherents; Mrs. Thomson's Memoirs of the Jacobites, vol. i.; Lacroix de Marlès' Histoire du Chevalier de Saint-Georges, 1876; Burton's Hist. of Scotland; Douglas's Scotch Peerage (Wood), ii. 217–9; Chambers's Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen; Chambers's Hist. of the Rebellion.] T. F. H.

ERSKINE, JOHN (1695–1768), Scotch lawyer, son of the Hon. Colonel John Erskine of Carnock, was born in 1695. He studied law and was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates in 1719, and practised without special success for some years. In 1737 he was appointed by the faculty and the town council, on the death of Professor Bain, to succeed him in the chair of Scots law in the university of Edinburgh. The emoluments were a salary of 100*l.* per annum and the fees. He was successful as a lecturer, and his class was well attended. In 1765 he resigned this appointment and devoted himself exclusively to the preparation of his 'Institutes,' which was published as a posthumous work. He died at Cardross, an estate formerly belonging to his grandfather, Lord Cardross (and which he had purchased in 1746), on 1 March 1768. Erskine married, first, Margaret Melville of Balgarvie, Fifeshire; secondly, Ann Stirling of Keir. By his first wife he had issue John Erskine (1721–1813), well known as the leader of the evangelical party in the Scottish church; by his second wife he had a family of four sons and two daughters.

Erskine wrote only two works, but both of these were of very great importance. They were: 1. 'Principles of the Law of Scotland, in the order of Sir George Mackenzie's Institutions of that Law.' This was first published in 1754 as a manual for the use of his class, for whom he had hitherto prescribed Sir George Mackenzie's work. It became at once popular. New editions were published under the author's supervision in 1757 and 1764, and after his death it was edited in succession by Gillon, Professor Schank More, Mr. Guthrie Smith, and Mr. William Guthrie. The seventeenth edition was published in 1886 by Professor Macpherson, by whom 'the book has been restored to its original position as the Scots law manual in the metropolitan university.' 2. 'Institutes of the Law of Scotland, in four books, in the order of Sir George Mackenzie's Institutions of that Law.' The first edition was published after the author's death in 1773, from his notes, which were carefully revised; the second was edited in 1784 by Lord Woodhouselee, who added the rubrics retained in subsequent issues; the fourth was issued in 1805 by Joseph Gillon; the fifth and sixth by Maxwell Morrison in 1812; the seventh by Lord Ivory in 1828, 'a model of full and accurate annotation;' the eighth by Alexander Macallan in 1838, and the ninth by J. B. Nicholson in 1871.

The 'Institutes' are divided into four books. The first treats of law in general, of the courts of Scotland, and of the relations between husband and wife, parent and child, minors and their tutors and curators, and master and servant; the second treats chiefly of heritable rights; the third of contracts and successions; the fourth of actions and crimes. The small space given to mercantile law in the work has been frequently remarked on. It has been pointed out by Professor Bell that at the time when Erskine wrote commercial enterprise in Scotland was at a low ebb. The failure of the Darien expedition, succeeded by the rebellions of 1715 and 1745, had turned the attention of the people to other subjects, while the great change in the possessors of landed property, due to the risings, made that branch of the law for a considerable period of preponderating importance.

In other respects Erskine's works were

written at a fortunate period. The law of Scotland, already considerably modified in some directions by English influence, had assumed in all its most essential parts its present shape. Even in commercial law the foundation was already laid, though the superstructure was not as yet erected. A treatise more suited to the needs of the time than the philosophical one of Stair or the two slight 'Institutions' of Sir George Mackenzie was required. Erskine supplied the want by giving a clear, connected view of the whole law, written in simple and direct language. The book is everywhere practical and to the point. Hence its value for everyday use. 'His work,' says Mr. Æneas Mackay, 'is peculiarly adapted to the tendencies of the Scottish intellect; plain rather than subtle, sure so far as he goes rather than going to the bottom of the subject; he is the lawyer of common sense, less antiquarian, and therefore now more practical, but also less philosophical and less learned than Stair.'

[Works; Anderson's Scottish Nation, ii. 158–9; Chambers's Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen, i. 547–8; Scots Mag. February 1768. p. 111; Mackay's Memoirs of Stair (Edin. 1873), p. 172.]

F. W–T.

ERSKINE, JOHN, D.D. (1721?–1803), theologian, was born at Edinburgh in 1720 or 1721 (his biographer thinks 1721), and educated at the university there. His father, John Erskine of Carnock, a grandson of Henry, first Lord Cardross, was professor of Scots law in the university of Edinburgh and author of a well-known work on the 'Principles of the Law of Scotland.' His mother was a daughter of the Hon. James Melvill of Bargarvie. Erskine's friends were most desirous that he should be a lawyer, but his devout and earnest spirit inclined him to the ministry; and his sense of duty becoming very clear, he chose that profession, contrary to the wishes of his family. At the university of Edinburgh he became acquainted with many young men of great ability, and was a member of a club called the Hen Club, along with Principal Robertson, Mr. John Home, and Dr. A. Carlyle. Before being settled in any charge he wrote a pamphlet in 1741, in opposition to certain views published by Dr. Archibald Campbell, professor of church history in the university of St. Andrews, whose strictures on the deistical work, 'Christianity as Old as the Creation,' were not deemed satisfactory by the church. Erskine adopted some of the views of Warburton in his 'Divine Legation of Moses,' which led to a friendship between the two divines, and to several letters on each side. In 1744 he was ordained minister of Kirkintilloch, near Glasgow, and he devoted himself with great earnestness and assiduity to the spiritual duties of his office. In 1746 he married the Hon. Christian Mackay, daughter of George, third Lord Reay.

While minister of Kirkintilloch, Erskine came into contact with George Whitefield, for whose character and labours he had done battle while a student at the university, Dr. Robertson having taken the opposite side. At Kirkintilloch he invited Whitefield to preach for him. For this it was attempted indirectly to censure him in the synod of Glasgow and Ayr. While warmly befriending Whitefield, Erskine stood in a very different relation to Wesley. He strongly disapproved of his views on predestination, perseverance, and other doctrines. This difference diminished his confidence in Wesley, with whom he never fraternised as he did with Whitefield.

Erskine began at an early period to cultivate relations with other churches and their ministers, especially in the colonies and on the European continent. He was on very intimate terms with many American ministers, and especially with Jonathan Edwards, with whom he had much correspondence, both on the subject of his books and on the remarkable religious awakening which occurred under his ministry at Northampton. Erskine was profoundly grieved when the relations between Britain and her American colonies became strained; and besides using all his influence in more private ways, published several pamphlets, in which he implored both sides to make some concession and avert the horrors of an unnatural war. All such efforts proved in vain, Erskine finding that his appeals for conciliation were simply ignored. He had much intercourse with divines in Holland and Germany, believing that it was for the benefit of his own church and country to be acquainted with the writings and proceedings of other churches. Not knowing any continental language but French, he set himself, when sixty years of age, to study German and Dutch, and with such success that he was very soon able to understand the drift of books in these languages.

In 1753 Erskine was translated to Culross, and in 1758 to the New Greyfriars, Edinburgh. In 1767 he was transferred to the Old Greyfriars, where he became colleague of Principal Robertson, with whom he was associated for six-and-twenty years. The university of Glasgow conferred on him the degree of D.D. in 1766.

Erskine, while most conscientiously devoted to the duties of his pastoral office, was a man of considerable literary activity. The list of his works given by his biographer embraces

twenty-five publications, and in addition to these he edited twenty. His chief works were: 1. A volume of 'Theological Dissertations,' 1765. 2. Pamphlets on the American question. 3. 'Considerations on the Spirit of Popery,' 1778. 4. 'Sketches and Hints of Church History and Theological Controversy, chiefly translated and abridged from modern foreign writers,' 2 vols. 1790 and 1797. 5. 'Letters on Loss of Children and Friends.' 6. A supplement to Gillies's 'Historical Collections,' 1796. 7. 'Discourses on Several Occasions,' 2 vols. 1798, 1804. The books which he edited and published in this country were chiefly works of Jonathan Edwards and other American divines.

Erskine was very heartily devoted to the doctrines and aims of the evangelical party in the church, of which his family connections, his stainless character, and his abilities as a preacher and a writer contributed to make him one of the leading champions. It was a testimony to the amiability of both that he and Principal Robertson, the leader of the 'moderate' party, should have been friendly colleagues in the same congregation for a quarter of a century. On one occasion, during the discussion of the catholic question, when a mob assembled with the intention of wrecking the house of the principal, who was on the unpopular side, Erskine appeared on the scene, and prevailed on the mob to withdraw. In the general assembly Erskine and Robertson were often opponents. Erskine cordially supported in the assembly a proposal in favour of foreign missions, which was opposed by Hamilton of Gladsmuir and the moderate party generally. The opening words of Erskine, as he rose to reply to Hamilton, became famous in the history of the mission cause. Pointing to a bible which lay on the table, and of which he intended to make use, and using a phrase very expressive in Scottish ears, he said, 'Rax me the Bible.'

The parents of Sir Walter Scott were members of Old Greyfriars, but it was with Erskine, not Robertson, that their sympathies lay. When in 'Guy Mannering' Sir Walter brings the English stranger to the Greyfriars, it is Erskine's preaching that he describes.

Among the learned correspondents of Erskine with whom he interchanged views on public, literary, or theological questions, besides those already named, were Lord Kames, Sir David Dalrymple (Lord Hailes), Bishop Hurd, and Mr. Burke. His correspondence with Kames bore on the question of free will, discussed in one of his lordship's essays, and more fully in the celebrated work of Jonathan Edwards. Lord Hailes (for whom Erskine had a very high respect and affection) corresponded on some points connected with the 'Sketches and Hints of Church History.' Bishop Hurd corresponded on other points in the same work. The correspondence with Burke related to the catholic question. Erskine wrote to Burke some of his reasons for dreading popery; Burke replied in a long and elaborate letter, not so much attempting to controvert Erskine's opinions as presenting the grounds on which he based his own.

Erskine enjoyed a hale old age, and continued in the performance of his pastoral duties, though in a constantly decreasing degree, till near the end. The evening before he died he was diligently employed in reading a new Dutch book. He went to bed at eleven, and died three hours after, on 19 Jan. 1803, in the eighty-second year of his age.

[Scott's Fasti; Memoir by Sir Henry Moncreiff Wellwood, Bart., D.D. (Edinburgh, 1818); Chambers's Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen; M'Crie's Sketches of Scottish Church History; Hugh Miller's Two Parties in the Church of Scotland.] W. G. B.

ERSKINE, RALPH (1685–1752), Scottish seceding divine and poet, born on 15 March 1685 at Monilaws, Northumberland, was the sixth son of Henry Erskine (1624–1696) [q. v.], by his second wife, Margaret Halcro. He entered the Edinburgh University in November 1699, and is said to have graduated M.A. in 1704, but his name is not in the published list of graduates. The date of his entrance is fixed by his narrative of a fire in the Parliament Close, where he lodged; he narrowly escaped being burned to death. After completing his arts course, he was engaged as tutor in the family of Colonel Erskine of Carnok, Fifeshire. Pursuing his theological studies, he was licensed on 18 June 1709 by Dunfermline presbytery. He is said to have early shown ability as a preacher, but did not at once obtain a call. His views were strongly evangelical, at a time when those of his brother Ebenezer [q. v.] were still undecided.

On 1 May 1711 he was called to the second charge at Dunfermline, and on 14 June to the parish of Tulliallan, Perthshire. He chose Dunfermline, where he was ordained on 7 Aug. The charge was collegiate, Erskine and his colleague, Thomas Buchanan, officiating in turns. Erskine, whose preaching was remarkable for its pathos, wrote his sermons closely; his portrait (as engraved in 1821) represents him as preaching with sermon-book in his hand. On 1 May 1716 he was transferred to the first charge, after the death of Buchanan.

Erskine took a zealous part in the ecclesiastical controversies which are detailed in the article on his brother Ebenezer. He and James Wardlaw, who had succeeded him in the second charge, were among the 'twelve apostles' of 1721. On 28 Sept. 1721 the synod of Fife arraigned him for 'Marrow doctrine,' and for non-compliance with the act of 1720 in reference thereto. The synod warned him to be more careful, on pain of censure, and required him to repeat his subscription in a sense adverse to the 'Marrow.' This he would not do; but was willing to subscribe the confession anew, in the sense of its original imposers. When, however, Ebenezer Erskine and his immediate followers were placed under sentence of deposition (1733), Ralph Erskine, while protesting against the assembly's course of action, did not immediately join the secession, though he was present at Gairney Bridge when the 'associate presbytery' was formed. It was not until 16 Feb. 1737 that he and Mair gave in to the Dunfermline presbytery a 'declaration of secession from the present judicatories of the church of Scotland,' not from the church itself. On 18 Feb. they were enrolled in the 'associate presbytery' at Orwell, Kinross-shire; and on 15 May 1740 were deposed with its other members.

Erskine conducted the correspondence with Whitefield which led the latter to visit Scotland in 1741. In vain did he impress upon Whitefield the duty of making common cause with the 'associate presbytery,' and not seeming 'equally to countenance' their 'persecutors.' Whitefield's revival (1742) at Cambuslang, Lanarkshire, a parish to which William M'Cullough, the minister, invited him, presented features which Erskine repudiated as enthusiastic. He wrote a special treatise, 'Faith no Fancy,' in which he maintains that the 'mental image' of 'Christ as man' is in no way 'helpful to the faith of his being Godman.' When the question of the burgess oath came up, Erskine sided with his brother in thinking that it was a matter to be left to individual consciences; and on the separation (1747) of the party opposed to the oath, he issued an admonition to the separatists under the title 'Fancy no Faith.'

Erskine was fond of music and a proficient on the violin. His poetic vein was shown, early in his ministry, by the composition of his 'Gospel Sonnets,' which reached the 10th edition in 1762, the 25th in 1797. They were followed by a paraphrase of the 'Song of Solomon' (1738), a version of the Book of Lamentations (1750), and a posthumous volume of 'Job's Hymns' (1753). His 'Scripture Songs' were collected in 1754. The preface shows that they were designed for use in public worship. Little can be said of the poetical merit of these pieces, but it is to be remembered that they were for the common people, who received them with avidity. The 'Gospel Sonnets' contain nothing in the shape of sonnets, but present a system of theology in verse, with much lively and quaint illustration. Phrases like the description of good works as 'the cleanest road to hell' (*Gospel Sonnets*, pt. i. chap. v. § iv.) readily stick in the reader's memory. It would appear from the preface to the 'Song of Solomon' that this paraphrase had been submitted to Watts, who had suggested a few improvements, but had not gone over the whole. One of Erskine's best pieces is 'Smoking Spiritualised,' five stanzas in continuation of 'an old meditation upon smoking tobacco.'

Erskine preached his last sermon on 29 Oct. 1752. Suddenly seized with a nervous fever, he died on 6 Nov. He was buried on 9 Nov. at Dunfermline, where on 27 June 1849 a statue of him, by Handyside Ritchie, was erected in front of the Queen Anne Street Church. He was twice married: first, on 15 July 1714, to Margaret (*d.* 22 Nov. 1730, aged 32), daughter of John Dewar of Lassodie; by her he had ten children, of whom Henry became the secession minister at Falkirk; John became secession minister at Leslie, and joined the 'anti-burghers;' James succeeded his uncle Ebenezer at Stirling: secondly, on 24 Feb. 1732, to Margaret (who survived him), daughter of Daniel Simpson, W.S., Edinburgh; by her he had four sons, of whom Robert became a merchant in London, a fellow of the Royal Society, and ultimately geographer and surveyor-general to the United States army.

In addition to the works already mentioned, Erskine published several single sermons (the earliest in 1738) and volumes of sermons, most of which, as well as the most important of his religious poems, will be found collected in his 'Practical Works,' edited by John Newlands, his son-in-law, Glasgow, 1764–6, 2 vols. fol. (portrait). There is an edition in ten volumes, Glasgow, 1777, 8vo; and London, 1821, 8vo.

[Memoir, by James Fisher (dated Glasgow, 16 Jan. 1764), prefixed to Practical Works, 1764; and other authorities enumerated in the article on Ebenezer Erskine.] A. G.

ERSKINE, THOMAS, first Earl of Kellie (1566–1639), the second son of Sir Alexander Erskine of Gogar, by Margaret, only daughter of George, fourth lord Home, was born in 1566. He was educated and to a great extent brought up with James I,

whose marked favour he enjoyed till the king's death. In 1585 he became a gentleman of the bedchamber, and between 1594 and 1599 various charters were granted him of Mitchellis, Eastertoun, and Westertoun in Kincardineshire, Windingtoun and Windingtounhall, and Easterrow. He was with the king at Perth in August 1600, when the Gowrie conspiracy was foiled, and in the general scuffle received a wound in the hand. For his services on this occasion a third part of Gowrie's lordship of Dirleton was granted him, and in warrandice thereof the king's barony of Corntoun, Stirlingshire. He accompanied the Duke of Lennox on his embassy to France in 1601, and on his return was admitted a member of the privy council, at the meetings of which he became one of the most regular attendants. He accompanied James into England in 1603, and was appointed captain of the yeomen of the guard in succession to Sir Walter Raleigh, continuing to hold the post till 1632. He was created Baron Dirleton in April 1604, was a groom of the stole in 1605, and in 1606 was raised to the dignity of Viscount Fenton, being the first to attain that degree in Scotland. Several further grants of land and a life interest in certain estates were obtained by Erskine, but he remained unsatisfied, and in October 1607 he is found writing to Salisbury proposing various schemes for his own advancement and requesting the minister's influence with the king (*Cal. State Papers*, Dom. 1603–10, p. 375). The petition appears to have been disregarded, as was also another which Erskine made in the following year for a command in the Low Countries. In May 1615 he was invested with the order of the Garter at the same time as Lord Knollys, and much popular interest was excited by the rivalry between the two new knights in the splendour of their procession to Windsor. In 1618 Erskine projected a scheme of respite of homage, the object of which was to raise money for the king, and was rewarded in the following year by his advancement to the earldom of Kellie. A grant of 10,000*l.* was made to Erskine in December 1625 for services to the late and present king. From 1630 to 1635 he sat on various commissions, but he did not succeed in gaining the prominence he desired in the direction of state affairs. He died 12 June 1639 in London, and was buried at Pittenweem, Fifeshire. He married first, Anne, daughter of Sir Gilbert Ogilvy, by whom he had a son, Alexander, and a daughter, Anne; secondly, in 1604, the widow of Sir Edward Norreys; and on her death he became the fourth husband of a daughter of Humphrey Smith of Cheapside, and widow of Benedict Barnham, Sir John Packington, and Robert, viscount Kilmorey. His differences with this last lady were such as to require the intervention of the king. He was succeeded in his honours by his grandson, Thomas, the eldest son of his son Alexander (*d.* 1633), by Lady Anne Seton, daughter of Alexander, earl of Dunfermline.

[Douglas and Wood's Peerage of Scotland, ii. 17; Anderson's Scottish Nation, ii. 594; Cal. State Papers, Dom. Ser. 1603–10, pp. 100, 135, 196, 343, 470, 1611–18, pp. 286, 374, 1625–6, p. 356, 1637, p. 184; Reg. Privy Council of Scotland (Rolls Ser.), vii. 267.] A. V.

ERSKINE, THOMAS, Lord (1750–1823), lord chancellor, was the youngest son of Henry David, tenth earl of Buchan. Of the exact date of his birth there is some doubt; it was, as he himself believed, in 1750, new style; the entry in the family bible is 'Jan. 10 O.S. 1749.' He was born in an upper flat in a high house at the head of Gray's Close in Edinburgh, where his father, whose income was only 200*l.* a year, was living in very straitened circumstances. For some time he with the rest of the family was taught by his mother, Agnes, second daughter of Sir James Steuart, bart., of Goodtrees, a woman of much capacity, cultivation, and piety, moving in a circle of peers, lawyers, and ministers of good position and strict presbyterian views. Afterwards at Uphall he was taught by Buchanan, subsequently a professor at Glasgow University; but it is almost certain that he never was, as has been said, at the Edinburgh High School (see Dr. Stevens, *History of the High School*). In 1762 the family removed for economy's sake to St. Andrews. Thomas, a quick, idle, and frolicsome boy, was sent to the grammar school under Mr. Hacket, where he learnt a moderate amount of Latin, and read a good deal of English in a desultory way. He was also a pupil of Richard Dick, afterwards professor of civil history in the St. Andrews University. In 1762 and 1763 he attended classes at the university in mathematics and natural philosophy, but he never matriculated. It was his wish to enter a learned profession, but his father could not afford the expense. It was proposed that he should enter the navy, but hating the sea, he begged for a commission in the army, where he would be able to pursue some of his studies. His parents were unable to buy a commission, and in March 1764 he became a midshipman on board the Tartar, commanded by Sir David Lindsay, and left Scotland for the West Indies. He did not revisit Scotland for upwards of half a century. For four years he cruised in the West Indies, contriving to read

a good deal, studying botany, and practising drawing. Here he formed a favourable opinion of the condition of the West Indian slaves, which determined his course on the emancipation question till near the end of his life. In 1765 he was struck by lightning at sea, but without serious results, and a letter of his describing the storm was printed in the 'St. James's Chronicle' 5 Dec. 1765. In 1768 he became acting lieutenant, under Commodore Johnson, Sir David Lindsay's successor, and returned home, hoping for promotion. On reaching Portsmouth the Tartar was paid off, and it became very uncertain when next Erskine would find employment. After acting as lieutenant he was too proud to return to sea as a midshipman, and his father having died about this time (1 Dec. 1767), he laid out the whole of his slender patrimony in buying a commission in the 2nd battalion of the 1st royal regiment of foot, of which John, duke of Argyll, was colonel. Berwick-on-Tweed (1768) was his first station, and St. Heliers, Jersey, his second (1769). Before he was of age, on 21 April 1770, he married, much against the wishes of her family, Frances, daughter of Daniel Moore, M.P. for Marlow. She died 26 Dec. 1805. Accompanied by his wife he went with his regiment to Minorca, and was stationed there for two years. During this time he read much English literature, especially Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, and Pope. According to his own account—but he was imaginative—he took the duty of an absent chaplain, preparing sermons, and excelling in extempore prayer. The manuscript, however, of a sermon composed in Jersey in 1769 has been preserved, along with a pamphlet on the choice of a wife, and some satirical verses written at Berwick, all unpublished (see Fergusson, *Henry Erskine*, appendix iii.). He composed in Minorca a humorous poem, the 'Petition of Peter,' which shows that his mind was already interested in English law (*Notes and Queries*, 3rd ser. x. 3). In 1772 he left Minorca, and, obtaining six months' leave, spent his time in London, where through his connections he obtained ready admission into society, and through his engaging qualities welcome and success. He frequented Mrs. Montagu's in Portman Square, and made Johnson's acquaintance there and elsewhere. 'On Monday, 6 April' [1772], writes Boswell, 'I dined with him at Sir Alexander Macdonald's, where was a young officer in the regimentals of the Scots Royal, who talked with a vivacity, fluency, and precision so uncommon that he attracted particular attention.' This was Erskine. He published about this time a pamphlet on 'Abuses in the Army;' though it was anonymous, its authorship was an open secret, and it was widely read. The authorship of another military pamphlet, 'Advice to the Officers of the British Army,' 1787, has been erroneously ascribed to him. Being now senior ensign, he was on 21 April 1773 promoted to be lieutenant. But he found his prospects poor, the expense of his family and of frequent removals from one garrison town to another considerable, and the work uncongenial. He would have a long time to wait before he got his next step by seniority, and he had no means to purchase a captaincy. He chanced one day to go into an assize court in his regimentals, and Lord Mansfield, who was presiding, being attracted by his appearance and learning his name, invited him to a seat on the bench, and commented to him upon the case as it proceeded. Erskine's attention was caught. On Lord Mansfield's suggestion he decided to go to the bar.

To diminish the then five years' period of studentship to three, he resolved to take an M.A. degree. He entered as a student at Lincoln's Inn 26 April 1775, sold his lieutenant's commission 19 Sept. 1775, and matriculated as a gentleman commoner at Trinity College, Cambridge, 13 Jan. 1776. As a nobleman's son he was entitled to a degree without examination, and although he resided, and gained the college prize for an English declamation, he declined the emolument, not considering himself a regular student. It is a formal piece on the thesis 'that the English House of Commons arose gradually out of the feudal tenures introduced at the Norman conquest.' It is printed in a pamphlet of 1794, 'Sketch of Erskine, with Anecdotes.' He studied classics very little, but read English diligently, and published a burlesque upon Gray's 'Bard,' called 'The Barber,' which, with 'The Farmer's Vision,' written in 1813, and privately printed in 1818, was published by J. Limbird in 1823 (see memoir prefixed). He received an honorary M.A. degree in June 1778. Meantime he had been studying law, first in the chambers of Buller, and next in those of Wood, both afterwards judges, with whom he read till 1779. He worked diligently, but never was a profound lawyer. He was a constant attendant and a successful speaker in debating societies, especially at the discussions in Coachmakers' Hall. His pamphlet on the army had brought him the acquaintance of Bentham, and he had other friends, but for three years with an increasing family he was often very poor. He had but 300*l.*, the gift of a relative, much of which went in fees, and he lived in a poor lodging in Kentish Town, faring in the barest manner. 'He was so shabbily dressed,' says Bentham,

'as to be quite remarkable.' On 3 July 1778 he was called to the bar, and within a few months mere accident brought him employment from which he started into instant fame and fortune. Thomas Baillie [q.v.] had made charges of corruption in the management of Greenwich Hospital against Lord Sandwich, first lord of the admiralty, and others, and they in Michaelmas term obtained a rule in the king's bench calling on Baillie to show cause why a criminal information for libel should not issue against him. While this was pending a shower of rain brought Erskine to the house of Welbore Ellis, and there at dinner was Captain Baillie. Quite ignorant of his presence Erskine inveighed against Lord Sandwich's conduct. Baillie heard he had been at sea, and sent him a retainer next day. Four other counsel were in the case; three advised a compromise, Erskine resisted it, and thereupon Baillie refused it. Cause was shown on 23 Nov. Erskine's leaders consumed the day in argument, and the court adjourned. On the 24th, when the solicitor-general was about to reply, Erskine rose, finding courage, as he said, by thinking that his children were plucking at his gown, crying to him that now was the time to get them bread, and made so fierce an onslaught on Lord Sandwich that, although it was perfectly irregular, it carried the day. Jekyll, coming into court in the middle of the speech, said he found the court, judges, and all 'in a trance of amazement.' Erskine at once received many retainers, and stepped into a large practice. It is characteristic of him that this account given to Jekyll differed from that given by him to Rogers, and that the number of the retainers steadily increased, and reached sixty-five before he died (Moore, *Diary*, vi. 75, vii. 271). He joined the home circuit, and in January 1779 represented Admiral Lord Keppel on his trial by court-martial at Portsmouth for incapacity shown in the engagement off Ushant against the French fleet under Count d'Orvilliers. Erskine advised Keppel during his thirteen days' trial, and wrote and delivered the speech for the defence (see letter printed in *Academy*, 22 Jan. 1876). It was successful, and on his acquittal Keppel gave him 1,000*l.* On 10 May he appeared at the bar of the House of Commons for Carnan, a printer, against the claim to a monopoly of printing almanacks, set up by the two universities and the Stationers' Company, and about the same time in the king's bench, in defence of Lieutenant Bourne, R.N., who was tried for sending a challenge to Admiral Sir James Wallace, his commanding officer. On 5 Feb. 1781 Lord George Gordon was tried for high treason in connection with the 'no popery' riots of June 1780, during which, by his own account, Erskine had offered to protect Lord Mansfield's house with a small military force himself, and did assist in defeating an attack on the Temple. Kenyon defended Gordon, with Erskine as his junior; but it was the speech of Erskine, delivered after midnight, that won the verdict of not guilty. From this time his civil practice was enormous. By 1783 he had made 8,000*l.* to 9,000*l.* since his call, besides discharging his debts. This appears from his will, the only one he ever made, executed 15 Nov. 1782, on the eve of a duel—a bloodless one—arising out of a ball-room quarrel with a surgeon, Dennis O'Brien, at Brighton. He easily excelled Lee, Garrow, and all his rivals. He early announced that he would not hold junior briefs. In 1783, on Lord Mansfield's suggestion, he received a silk gown, then a rare and great distinction, and in that year received his first special retainer of three hundred guineas, said indeed to have been the first known at the bar. From that time he had on an average one per month. He made while at the bar 150,000*l.* (Moore, *Memoirs*, vi. 75), and his clerk was said to have received fees to the extent of 20,000*l.* (Campbell, *Autobiography*, i. 193). 'I continue highly successful in my profession,' he writes to Lord Auckland, 16 July 1786, 'being now, I may say, as high as I can go at the bar. The rest depends on politics, which at present are adverse' (*Brit. Mus. Add. MS.* 29475). His income reached 10,000*l.* in 1791, sixteen hundred guineas more than had ever been made in a year at the bar before. He was the first barrister who made it a rule not to go on circuit except for a special fee. He was a favourite alike with Lord Mansfield and his successor, Lord Kenyon. The growth of commerce and the many maritime and commercial questions arising out of the hostilities with France during his career produced a great increase in litigation, out of which an almost new department of law was created. Erskine was in almost every one of these causes, generally for the plaintiff, for twenty years, and although never a profound jurist must have thus helped no little to form our commercial law. He excelled, however, in cases of criminal conversation. In Parslow *v.* Sykes he obtained a verdict for the plaintiff for 10,000*l.*; and appearing for the defendant in Baldwin *v.* Oliver, he reduced the damages to a shilling. He enjoyed perfect health. During twenty-seven years of practice indisposition never caused him a single day's absence from court. A severe illness with abscesses in the throat in 1792 fortunately occurred in September (*Gent. Mag.* April 1824). His figure was elastic and erect, his

eye brilliant and captivating, his movements rapid, his voice sharp and clear, and without a trace of Scotch accent. At first his arguments and authorities were laboriously prepared, and read from a manuscript volume. Till his day there were few classical allusions or graces of rhetoric in the king's bench. His oratory, never overloaded with ornament, but always strictly relevant and adapted to the needs of the particular case, set a new example, as his courtesy and good humour considerably mitigated the previous asperities of nisi prius practice. He never bullied a witness as Garrow did, though he fell short of Garrow in the subtlety with which he put his questions. At his busiest —and the preparation of his cases was chiefly done early in the morning before the trial— he never lost his vivacity or high spirits, and no doubt this, his presence, and his rank assisted not a little in his success. 'Even the great luminaries of the law,' says Wraxall (*Posthumous Memoirs*, i. 82), 'when arrayed in their ermine bent under his ascendency, and seemed to be half subdued by his intelligence, or awed by his vehemence, pertinacity, and undaunted character' (see 'My Contemporaries,' by a retired barrister, in *Fraser's Magazine*, vii. 178; *Lord Abinger's Life*, p. 64; *Lond. Mag.* March 1826, probably by Serjeant Talfourd; COLCHESTER, *Diary*, i. 24).

Like his family Erskine was a whig. He was the intimate friend of Sheridan and Fox. On the formation of the coalition government he was, though at the cost of losing his lucrative parliamentary practice, brought into parliament for Portsmouth, Sir William Gordon, the sitting member, making way for him, and he was promised the attorney-generalship on the first opportunity. He was a favourite of the Prince of Wales, and was appointed his attorney-general in 1783. Only his youth prevented his appointment to the chancellorship of the duchy of Cornwall. This post, which had been in abeyance from the time of its last holder, Lord Bacon, the prince always designed for him; he even during their estrangement after Paine's trial kept it vacant for him, and eventually appointed him to it in 1802. He held the office until he became lord chancellor. Had the king not recovered from his insanity in 1789, Erskine would have been attorney-general in the regent's administration. He was, however, more the prince's friend and companion than his political adviser. His first speech in the House of Commons was on Fox's India bill. So anxious was he to succeed that he asked Fox on the day before what cut and colour of coat he should wear. Fox advised a black one (MOORE, *Diary*, iv. 136). But his speech was a failure. Pitt sat paper and pen in hand ready to take notes for a reply, then, as the speech went on, lost interest, and finally threw away the pen. This byplay crushed Erskine, who feared Pitt. As Sheridan said to him, 'You are afraid of Pitt, and that is the flabby part of your character.' Even in 1805, as the Duke of Wellington told Lord Stanhope, such was the 'ascendency of terror' that Pitt exercised over him, that a word and a gesture from Pitt completely checked and altered a speech of Erskine's at the Guildhall banquet. 'He was awed like a schoolboy at school.' Pitt, who had been once or twice with Erskine in a cause, disliked him, and spoke of him as following Fox in debate and 'weakening his argument as he went along.' He never succeeded in the House of Commons or caught its tone. As he himself said, in parliament he missed the hope of convincing his audience and leading them to the determination he desired. Like Curran he was so great in defending a political prisoner that he seemed tame by comparison on any other occasion. Indeed on 30 Dec. 1796, in answer to Pitt's great speech upon the rupture of the negotiations with France, he actually broke down in moving an amendment to Pitt's motion for an address to the king praying for a vigorous prosecution of the war, and Fox was obliged to take up the thread and speak instead of him. For years after this Erskine hardly spoke. When the coalition government went out and Pitt came in, Erskine went into active opposition. He moved and carried by a majority of seventy-three a resolution that the house would consider as an enemy of the country any one who advised the king to dissolve parliament; he supported Fox's motion for going into committee to consider the state of the nation on 12 Jan., and denounced Pitt's India Bill on 23 Jan. 1784. On 18 Feb. he made his last speech for many years in the House of Commons, in support of the motion to stop supplies, the king having disregarded the house's address praying for the dismissal of ministers. A dissolution followed, and the public indignation at the coalition government destroyed the whigs. Erskine was one of 'Fox's Martyrs' and lost his seat. He returned to parliamentary practice. He appeared for Fox before the House of Commons in July 1784 on the 'Westminster scrutiny,' on which occasion he used great license of speech, and on 3 March 1788, appearing as counsel for the East India Company, 'delivered,' as Lord Mornington wrote to the Marquis of Buckingham, 'the most stupid, gross, and indecent libel against Pitt that ever was imagined. The abuse was so monstrous that the house hissed him at his con-

clusion. . . . Pitt took no sort of notice of Erskine's Billingsgate' (STANHOPE, *Life of Pitt*, i. 256). It appears that Erskine being indisposed an adjournment was taken in the middle of his speech, and in the meantime he dined, perhaps too well, with the Prince of Wales, and was by him prompted to make this attack (JESSE, *Memoirs of George III*, iii. 28).

In the meantime he had been winning enduring fame in those causes on which his legal and oratorical reputation rests, causes connected with the law of libel and treason. Sir William Jones had published a tract on government called 'A Dialogue between a Gentleman and a Farmer.' Shipley, dean of St. Asaph, reprinted and recommended it. The crown declining to prosecute the dean for this, the matter was taken up by the Hon. Mr. FitzMaurice, and Erskine was retained for the defence. The case came on at the Wrexham autumn assizes 1783, was removed into the king's bench in the spring, and finally tried at the summer assizes at Shrewsbury in 1784. Mr. Justice Buller directed that the jury was merely to find the publication and the truth of the innuendoes as laid; whether the words constituted a libel or not was for the court. Erskine subsequently, in Michaelmas term, argued against this in a very fine speech upon a motion for a rule for a new trial. The rule was refused, but the question was finally set at rest by the passing of Fox's Libel Act (32 Geo. III, c. 60) in 1792, which enacted that the question of libel or no libel in each particular case is for the jury. In 1789 Stockdale published a pamphlet by one Logan against the impeachment of Hastings. Fox brought this publication before the House of Commons as a libel on the managers of the impeachment, and carried a motion for an address to the crown praying that the attorney-general might prosecute Stockdale. Sir Alexander Macdonald filed an information accordingly, which was tried in the king's bench before Lord Kenyon and a special jury on 9 Dec. 1789. Erskine's speech for the defence produced an unexampled effect on the audience, and Stockdale was acquitted.

At the election of 1790 Erskine was returned for Portsmouth, a seat which he held till he became a peer. On 22 Dec., separating himself from the rest of his party, he supported the contention that the dissolution had put an end to the impeachment of Hastings, but he broke down in his speech. He spoke in general but little. In April 1792, on Grey's motion for parliamentary reform, he defended the Society of Friends of the People; and when the whig party was divided upon the attitude to be assumed towards the French revolution, Erskine, who had visited Paris in September 1790 to witness its progress and had returned full of admiration for its principles (ROMILLY, *Memoirs*, 25 Sept. 1790), followed Fox in regarding it as a movement towards liberty, and censured both the policy of enacting new penal laws against the Jacobins and the Traitorous Correspondence Bill. This imperilled his favour with the Prince of Wales; his next step lost it. In 1792 Paine, whose 'Rights of Man,' pt. ii., contained offensive attacks on the royal family, was prosecuted. Erskine accepted the brief for the defence, in spite of many attacks from the government newspapers, much dissuasion by his friends, including Lord Loughborough, and an express message from the Prince of Wales. On 18 Dec. 1792 the jury, without waiting for reply or summing-up, found Paine guilty. Erskine was dismissed from his office of attorney-general to the Prince of Wales. As, however, Sir A. Pigot, the prince's solicitor-general, was dismissed also, though unconnected with Paine's case, it is probable that the real ground of offence was that both were members of the Society of Friends of the People for Advocating Parliamentary Reform. Erskine was one of the original members of the Society of Friends of the Liberty of the Press, and presided at its first and second meetings, 22 Dec. 1792 and 19 Jan. 1793. The government now began a series of prosecutions. The first was that of John Frost in March 1793. In spite of Erskine's efforts he was convicted. For Perry and Grey, proprietors of the 'Morning Chronicle,' indicted 9 Dec. 1793 for inserting in the paper the address of a society for political information held at Derby, which complained of the state of the parliamentary representation, he procured an acquittal. In the case of Walker, too, tried on 2 April 1794 for a conspiracy to raise a rebellion, he destroyed the crown witnesses in cross-examination, and the verdict was not guilty. The government next attacked the advocates of reform with prosecutions, in which the theory of constructive treason was put forward. Erskine was successful in defeating them. After secret committees of both houses had reported, an act was passed suspending the Habeas Corpus Act in view of the forthcoming trials. True bills were found against twelve persons, the only overt act alleged being a conspiracy to summon a convention. The trials began on 28 Oct. 1794 at the Old Bailey, before Lord-chief-justice Eyre and other judges, under a special commission of oyer and terminer. Hardy's case was taken first. Scott, the attorney-general, took nine hours to open his case; the jury was locked up for the night, and day after day from

8 A.M. to midnight the case proceeded. On the last day Erskine spoke from 2 P.M. to 9 P.M., his voice dying away into a whisper at the end from exhaustion. Still on leaving court he had to address the vast crowds, which had collected outside every day and had escorted him home and mobbed Scott every night, begging them to leave the law to take its course (Twiss, *Eldon*, i. 270). After some hours of consultation the jury returned a verdict of not guilty. The crown persevered. Horne Tooke was tried next, and the jury acquitted him without leaving the box; then Thelwall, who also escaped. No more cases were taken. Bonfires were lit, and the crowd dragged Erskine's carriage in triumph to his house in Serjeants' Inn. His portraits and busts were sold all over the country, tokens were struck bearing his effigy, and he was presented with the freedom of numerous corporations. Subsequently he defended William Stone, for whom he procured an acquittal in spite of strong evidence that he had invited a French invasion. On 26 July 1796 he appeared at Shrewsbury to defend the Bishop of Bangor and several of his clergy on a charge of riot, committed while ejecting from the diocesan registry one Grindley, who claimed to be registrar. He appeared on 24 June 1797 as prosecutor for the Society for the Suppression of Vice, which proceeded against Williams, a bookseller, who had sold Paine's 'Age of Reason.' He delivered a powerful speech in support of the truth of christianity, and obtained a conviction, but the society rejecting his view of the proper course to pursue in suppressing such publications he declined to appear further for them. In this year appeared his pamphlet on the 'Causes and Consequences of the War with France,' which, though in great part written in court during the hearing of cases, ran quickly through forty-eight editions. In 1799 he defended, but without success, the Earl of Thanet and Robert Cutlar Fergusson [q. v.] at the bar of the king's bench, who were tried for an attempted rescue of Arthur O'Connor as he was being re-arrested after being acquitted of high treason. It was an unfortunate answer of Sheridan's in cross-examination that lost the case. Both were fined and sentenced to a year's imprisonment. On 21 Feb. 1799 he defended Cuthell, a respectable bookseller, who had inadvertently sold some copies of Gilbert Wakefield's pamphlet in answer to the Bishop of Llandaff, and though the prisoner was convicted his punishment was remitted. On 15 May James Hadfield fired at the king at Drury Lane Theatre, and was tried on 26 April 1800. Erskine defended him and established his plea of insanity, and under the statute 40 Geo. III, c. 96, subsequently passed, Hadfield was confined for the remainder of his life. In all these cases his speeches, which are models of advocacy and forensic eloquence, were published.

In the House of Commons he had been in the meantime playing a less and less conspicuous part. There seems to have been some doubt of his complete fidelity to the whigs. Rose says that Pitt had told him of overtures made by Erskine many years before 1806, perhaps in 1797, and when Addington came in (January 1801) Erskine wrote to him expressing a disposition to take office (Rose, *Diaries*, ii. 253; Pellew, *Sidmouth*, i. 476, ii. 256). After the suggestions which were made of his taking the chancellorship from Addington, to which the Prince of Wales's opposition put an end, his practice for some time fell off. He spoke and voted seldom in the House of Commons during the last years of Pitt's administration. He opposed the projected coalition between Fox and a section of Pitt's former followers, friends of Grenville and Windham, drafted the remonstrance to Fox which was adopted at the meeting at Norfolk House, and supported the peace of Amiens. His principal speeches were on 17 Nov. 1795, against the Seditious Meetings Bill; on 30 Nov., against the bill to make conspiracy to levy war against the crown high treason, though no overt act were proved; in seconding Grey's annual motion for reform, 26 May 1797; and on 3 Feb. 1799, upon the rejection of the overtures for peace made by Bonaparte on becoming first consul. He did not speak on the union with Ireland. In 1802 he visited Paris during the peace, and found himself almost unknown. He was presented to Napoleon. 'Etes-vous légiste?' said Napoleon. This was crushing to Erskine's egotism (Trotter, *Memoirs of Fox*, p. 268; but see Campbell's *Life* on this, p. 541). He knew little French, and never revisited the continent. Like most of the other whigs he supported (23 May 1803) the renewal of the war on the rupture of the peace of Amiens, and the imposition of the property tax on 5 July. Of his speech on the army estimates (12 Dec.) Fox writes: 'Erskine made a foolish figure, I hear.' When the volunteers were raised he became colonel of the Temple corps. He never had been more than able to put his company in the royals through their manual exercise; now he was seen by Campbell giving the word of command from directions written on a card, and doing it ill. However, he argued successfully in the king's bench the right of volunteers to resign without waiting for the

conclusion of the war (Rex *v.* Dowley, 4 *East's Reports*, p. 512), a more congenial task, and on 19 March 1804, in his last speech in the House of Commons, opposed, also with success, the clause forbidding resignations, which was inserted in the Volunteers' Consolidation Bill.

In 1806, after Pitt's death, it became necessary to include some of the whigs in the Grenville administration. Eldon was not sufficiently loyal to a mixed cabinet of colleagues to be trusted with the seals, and, after being refused by Lord Ellenborough and Sir James Mansfield, chief justice of the common pleas, they were on 7 Feb. 1806 given to Erskine. The appointment was generally condemned. He had refused to hold briefs before the House of Lords and privy council, was ignorant of equity, and experienced only as an advocate at nisi prius. 'He is totally unfit for the situation,' writes Romilly. From this time he sank into comparative insignificance. He took his title, Baron Erskine of Restormel, from the castle of that name in Cornwall, out of compliment to the Prince of Wales. His motto, 'Trial by jury,' was much derided. He took his seat on 10 Feb., and being quick, cautious, and attentive, and receiving some assistance from the equity counsel in practice before him, made few blunders as a judge; but he was ignorant of real property law and neglected to study it, contenting himself with making Hargrave a queen's counsel and employing him to work up authorities. In his hands equitable principles received little development or adaptation, though his decisions do not deserve the title of the 'Apocrypha,' which they received. His only considerable decision is Thelusson *v.* Woodford (Dowling, *Reports*, p. 249), on the doctrine of election by an heir. But his chief judicial act was to preside at the trial of Lord Melville in June 1806, which he insisted must, unlike Hastings's impeachment, proceed *de die in diem*, and be conducted according to regular legal forms. In most of the divisions in this trial he voted in the minority for finding Lord Melville guilty. In the House of Lords he was assisted on appeals by Lords Eldon and Redesdale, and deferred greatly to them, and on one occasion, when sitting at first instance, was assisted by Sir William Grant, master of the rolls. On 7 June 1806 he, with Lords Grenville, Spencer, and Ellenborough, was commissioned by the king to inquire into the charges against the Princess of Wales of adultery with Sir Sidney Smith and others. The charges were declared groundless.

In the ministry he was not much consulted, nor did he very frequently take part in the debates of the House of Lords. He was not informed of Lord Howick's bill for allowing Roman catholics to hold commissions in the army until it was about to be introduced, and did not speak at all from the meeting of the new parliament in December 1806 until March 1807. Earlier in 1806 he had defended the inclusion in the cabinet of Lord Ellenborough, though lord chief justice, and had supported the bill for the immediate abolition of the slave trade. After the king's insurmountable opposition to Lord Howick's bill had brought the ministry face to face with resignation, Erskine was much chagrined at the prospect of losing office, and Lord Holland's account of the cabinet of 10 Feb. shows that he struggled hard to avoid the necessity of adhering to his colleagues (Lord Holland, *Memoirs*, ii. 184). When the king demanded his ministry's written promise never again to propose to him a relaxation of the Roman catholic penal laws, Erskine went to expostulate with him, and in a long interview on 14 March imagined that he had converted him. On the 24th, however, the intrigues of Eldon and the Duke of Cumberland succeeded, and the king dismissed his ministers. Some suspicion was caused by the fact that Erskine did not resign the seals till 1 April. This was not, however, due to his having abandoned his colleagues, but was intended to give him time to deliver judgment in pending cases in which he had already heard all the arguments. He, however, somewhat unfairly, took the opportunity in the interval to prevail on Sir William Pepys to resign his mastership in chancery, and to appoint to the vacant post Edward Morris, his own son-in-law. The mode in which this change of ministry took place was so extraordinary that strong hopes were entertained of a return of the ministry of 'All the Talents' to office, but when, a few months later, this seemed immediately probable, Romilly observes that Erskine was not likely to be chancellor again, 'his incapacity for the office was too forcibly and too generally felt.' From this time Erskine gradually dropped out of public life. On 13 April he defended the conduct of the late ministry in refusing the pledge demanded of them, and in the new parliament he moved that the king's personal inclinations ought not to be of any binding effect on ministers (26 June), but the motion was lost by 67 to 160. In this new parliament the whigs were almost annihilated, the ministerial majority being two hundred, and, like many other whigs, Erskine almost entirely neglected parliament for some

years. He opposed the Copenhagen expedition and the orders in council, and entered a protest against the bill to prohibit the exportation of jesuits' bark to Europe. The only question in which he interested himself was the prevention of cruelty to animals, for which he introduced a bill on 15 May 1809, which passed the lords but was lost in the commons by 37 to 27, and another in the following session, which he withdrew. He was always attached to animals and had many pets, a dog which he introduced at consultations, a goose, and even two leeches, and in 1807 he published privately a pamphlet, 'An Appeal in favour of the Agricultural Services of Rooks' (*Notes and Queries*, 1st series, i. 138). The subject was at length dealt with by the act 3 Geo. IV, c. 71. Gradually, too, he altered his early views on slavery, and inclined more and more to emancipation. In 1810, yielding to his besetting sin of seeking popularity, he maintained, on the committal of Sir F. Burdett to the Tower, that all questions of privilege ought to be decided by courts of law only. When the regency became necessary he had high hopes from the Prince of Wales, with whom he was still very intimate, and who had even given him, while chancellor, an uncut topaz seal-ring, with the request that it might not be cut for the present, as he intended to give him an earl's coronet to engrave upon it. He strenuously opposed the proposed restrictions on the regent's powers. But the prince threw the whigs over, and Erskine's hopes of office finally vanished. He retired into private life, attending but little to the judicial and other business of the House of Lords.

He lived the life of an idler and man about town, sometimes melancholy in private, but in company extraordinarily vivacious and sprightly, a characteristic which he always retained (Rush, *Recollections*, p. 118). He fell into pecuniary straits. Always careless of money—he once dropped 20,000*l.* of stock on the floor of a shop—in spite of his great professional earnings and his chancellor's pension of 4,000*l.* a year, he was now poor. Apprehensive of revolution in England he had invested large sums in the United States and lost them. He had given up his house in Lincoln's Inn Fields and now sold his house at Hampstead, Evergreen Villa, and bought an estate in Sussex and took to the study of farming. The estate proved sterile, and though he began to manufacture brooms, as the only things it would produce, his loss was heavy. He haunted the courts at Westminster, expressing many regrets that he ever left the bar, interested himself in his inn, of which he had become a bencher in 1785 and treasurer in 1795, in anniversary dinners and literary institutions, and appeared at innumerable parties and balls. He took to letters, and wrote, at first anonymously, a political romance, 'Armata,' an imitation of More's 'Utopia' and Swift's 'Gulliver,' which ran through several editions. To the cause of law reform he was indifferent, and, having taken charge in the House of Lords in 1814 of Romilly's bill to subject freehold estates to the payment of simple contract debts, he neglected it so much, since he 'did not understand the subject and was incapable of answering any objections,' that it had to be entrusted to other hands (Romilly, *Memoirs*, 5 Nov. 1815). Some comment was excited by his accepting from the regent the knighthood of the Thistle, and more by his wearing the insignia on every possible occasion. From 1817 he began to return to active public life; he opposed both the Seditious Meetings Bills and the act for the suspension of habeas corpus, and during 1819 and 1820 offered a most determined opposition to the six acts, resisting them at every stage, and also supported Lord Lansdowne's motion for a committee to inquire into the state of the country. He had not been in Scotland since he went to sea as a lad of fourteen. He was now invited and went to a public banquet at Edinburgh 21 Feb. 1820 (Campbell wrongly says 1821); yet so bitter was party spirit that Scott refused to meet him (Lockhart, *Scott*, vi. 369). Upon the trial of Queen Caroline he took a part which was deservedly popular, and, in spite of his obligations to the king, insisted in all the debates on securing a fair trial for the queen. In these debates his voice was very influential. Unlike most of the whigs he voted for submitting the 'green bag' to a secret committee, but he proposed a resolution that the queen should have a list of the witnesses before the second reading, which was lost by 28 to 78; resisted successfully the motion of the attorney-general for an adjournment to give time for fresh witnesses to arrive; opposed the second reading on 2 Nov. and 4 Nov., and again attacked the bill in committee, and his speech on the third reading was the last of any importance which he delivered in parliament. His health indeed was failing, and in the middle of his speech on 2 Nov. he was seized with cramp and fell senseless on the floor. His chivalrous speeches on behalf of the queen revived his almost forgotten popularity. But his public part was almost played. On 10 July 1822 he recorded his protest against the Corn Law Bill (3 Geo. IV, c. 26), on the ground that it diminished instead of increasing agricultural protection. He made some efforts

on behalf of the popular party in Spain; in 1822 he published a letter to Lord Liverpool in behalf of the cause of Greek independence; in 1823 a letter of his to Prince Mavrocordato was published by the Greek committee, and in the same year he issued a pamphlet called 'A Letter to the Proprietors of Land on Agricultural Prosperity.' He was quite estranged from the king, and had fallen into poverty and some social discredit. At various times, from as early as 1796, he had been accused of opium-eating, but without any foundation. He was living now partly at 13 Arabella Row, Pimlico, partly at a cottage, Buchan Hill, in Sussex. At some time not ascertainable he married at Gretna Green a Miss Mary Buck, by whom he had a son, Hampden, born 5 Dec. 1821. She and her child were in very straitened circumstances after his death. In the autumn of 1823 he started for Scotland by sea to visit his brother the Earl of Buchan, at Dryburgh Abbey, Berwickshire. Inflammation of the chest attacked him on the voyage; he was landed at Scarborough and thence conveyed to Almondell, West Lothian, the residence of his brother Henry's widow, and died there 17 Nov. 1823. He was buried at the family burial-place, Uphall, Linlithgow. His character was amiable and elevated, but his distinguishing characteristic was an inordinate vanity, which perpetually made him ridiculous. Almost the best of Canning's 'Anti-Jacobin Papers' is a burlesque speech of Erskine's at the Whig Club in which he is made to point out that he was but a very little lower than the angels. He was caricatured as Counsellor Ego, and as Baron Ego of Eye, and Cobbett always wrote of him as Baron Clackmannan. His wit was proverbial, and many of his epigrams are classic, but he especially excelled in puns. He was an honourable politician, an enthusiast for liberty, and an incomparable advocate and orator. He was an enthusiastic student of English classics, and, in spite of sarcasms on himself, a great admirer of Burke. He knew by heart 'Paradise Lost,' 'Paradise Regained,' and Burke's speech against Warren Hastings. Lord John Russell's phrase sums up his character: 'The tongue of Cicero, and the soul of Hampden.' By his first marriage he had four sons and four daughters. His eldest and fourth sons, David Montagu, diplomatist, and Thomas, judge, are separately noticed. A portrait of him was painted by Sir T. Lawrence, and there is another by Hoppner at Windsor, a statue by Westmacott in Lincoln's Inn Hall, and a bust by Nollekens at Holland House.

[See the various editions of his speeches; Lives of him by Brougham, Townsend, and Campbell (Lives of the Chancellors, vol. vi.); Moore's Diaries; Romilly's Memoirs; Wraxall's Memoirs; the Croker Papers; Stanhope's Pitt; Lord Holland's Memoirs; Pellew's Lord Sidmouth; Croly's Life of George IV; Sir Henry Holland's Recollections, 2nd ed. p. 244; Duméril's Lord Erskine, a Study, Paris, 1883; Lord Colchester's Diary; Johnstone's ed. of Parr's Works, 1828, vii. 120, 626; Diary of Mme. d'Arblay (1842), v. 319, vi. 42; The Pamphleteer, vol. xxiii. 1824; Sketch of Erskine with Anecdotes, pamphlet, 1794; and for specimens of his wit Rogers's Recollections; Notes and Queries, 2nd ser. viii. 25, 115.] J. A. H.

ERSKINE, THOMAS (1788–1864), judge, fourth son of Thomas, first lord Erskine [q. v.], by his first wife, Agnes, daughter of Daniel Moore, was born 12 March 1788 at 10 Serjeants' Inn, Fleet Street. He was brought up at Hampstead and educated at the grammar school there, and at a Mr. Foothead's, and was afterwards under Drs. Drury and Butler at Harrow, where he was a schoolfellow of Peel, Aberdeen, Palmerston, Byron, and Hook. On becoming lord chancellor his father made him, still a schoolboy, his secretary of presentations, which threw him much into fashionable society. He was, however, entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, and being a peer's son graduated M.A. without residence or examination in 1811, on the inauguration of the Duke of Gloucester as chancellor. In 1807 he was entered at Lincoln's Inn, and became a pupil of Joseph Chitty [q. v.] He became a special pleader in 1810, and practised with success; was called to the bar in 1813, and having first joined the home circuit transferred himself to the western. He took no part in politics but pursued his practice, became a king's counsel in 1827, and took a leading place on his circuit. He was clear and acute rather than rhetorical, and had a strong comprehension of technicalities, being thus in sharp contrast to his father. The Bankruptcy Act, 1 and 2 Wm. IV, c. 56, established a court of review of four judges, and Lord Brougham appointed him to the chief judgeship on 20 Oct. 1831, a post which he filled with credit. He was also sworn of the privy council. On the death of Alan Park, he succeeded him, 9 Jan. 1839, as a judge of the common pleas, but continued to hold his bankruptcy judgeship till November 1842. In his new capacity his chief act was presiding at the spring assizes at York in 1840, at the political trials, which he did so fairly as to receive the applause even of the 'Northern Star,' Feargus O'Connor's paper. In 1844 he was attacked by tubercular disease of the lungs, and resigned his judgeship in November, but lived,

for the most part an invalid, till 9 Nov. 1864, when he died at Bournemouth. From the summer of 1852 he lived at Fir Grove, Eversley, and was the intimate friend and valued supporter of the rector, C. Kingsley, to whom his death was a great loss. He was till his death a commissioner for the Duchy of Cornwall, and in 1840 was president of the Trinitarian Bible Society. He married in 1814 Henrietta, daughter of Henry Traill of Darsie, Fifeshire, and had a large family.

[Foss's Lives of the Judges; Arnold's Life of Lord Denman; Life of C. Kingsley, i. 329, ii. 211; Rush's Recollections, 237.] J. A. H.

ERSKINE, THOMAS (1788–1870), of Linlathen, Forfarshire, advocate and theologian, was the youngest son of David and Ann Erskine. His great-grandfather was Colonel John Erskine of Carnock, near Dunfermline, a descendant of John, first or sixth Earl of Mar [q. v.], regent of Scotland. The colonel's son was John Erskine (1695–1768) [q. v.], whose second son, David, was a writer to the signet, and purchased the estate of Linlathen, near Dundee, which, by the death without surviving issue of his elder brothers, came into the possession of Thomas Erskine in 1816.

Owing to his father's death when he was little more than two years old, Erskine was left very much to the care of his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Graham of Airth Castle, a Stirling of Ardoch, a strict episcopalian and a strong Jacobite. Erskine was educated at the Edinburgh High School, a school in Durham, and the university of Edinburgh, and was admitted a member of the Faculty of Advocates in 1810. He was welcomed by the literary society for which Edinburgh was then famous. The religious tendencies implanted in his childhood were confirmed by the death of his cousin, Patrick Stirling of Kippenross, and by the example of his brother James, who was a captain of the 87th regiment, and was once described by his commanding officer as the best soldier and the best man he ever knew. Upon his succeeding, by the death of his brother, to the estate of Linlathen, Erskine retired from the bar, and gave himself up to the study of questions of theology. His means enabled him to travel and to alleviate his strong artistic instincts. His views thus acquired a breadth that gave them acceptance beyond the narrow circle of professional theologians, and he numbered among his friends such men as Thomas Carlyle, Dean Stanley, Bishop Ewing, F. D. Maurice, Prévost-Paradol, Vinet, Adolphe Monod, Madame de Broglie, and others whom he met on his foreign tours. His influence was of a singularly subtle character, due more to his intensely sympathetic nature than to his force of reasoning. His outward life was marked by few stirring events, but he stimulated powerfully, though indirectly, the religious life of his time. In earlier life he busied himself in writing for the press, and in public expositions of his views on contemporary religious controversies. But he was afterwards contented with personal intercourse and correspondence. Prévost-Paradol, on taking leave of him in his eightieth year, described him in reverential tones as 'that kind of old prophet.'

In 1831 the general assembly of the church of Scotland deposed Mr. J. M'Leod Campbell, minister of Row, for preaching the doctrine of 'universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ.' Erskine warmly espoused the cause of Campbell, and, indeed, went very much beyond Campbell's opinions, for he clung to the belief that ultimately all men would be saved and restored to the image of God by the same atonement of Christ. He regarded life as an education rather than a probation; and founded his belief in inspiration upon the testimony of the conscience, not upon the credence of miracles.

In the exposition of his religious belief Erskine published several works, the most notable of which are 'Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth of Revealed Religion,' Edinburgh, 1820; 'An Essay on Faith,' 1822; 'The Unconditional Freeness of the Gospel,' 1828; 'The Brazen Serpent, or Life coming through Death,' 1831; 'The Doctrine of Election,' 1837; and 'The Spiritual Order,' published after his death in 1871.

One of his most intimate friends was F. D. Maurice, whose views were greatly in accordance with his own. The two maintained a constant interchange of ideas from 1838, when they first met, until Erskine's death. Erskine was nominally a member of the church of Scotland, although he rarely availed himself of its ministrations. He certainly was no Anglican, yet he daily read the lessons and psalms appointed for the day by the Book of Common Prayer. Though not a Calvinist, he always expressed himself as deeply thankful to the 'Calvinian atmosphere' in which he had been brought up, for, he said, 'Calvinism makes God and the thought of Him all in all, and makes the creature almost as nothing before Him.' He used to say that Calvinism was a sheep in wolf's clothing, while Arminianism was a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Erskine was never married. His sister Christian, Mrs. Stirling, was his constant companion. He called her 'mother, wife, sister, all in one.' She managed his household, and stood between him and the outer

world, and by her rare skill as a hostess made his home at Linlathen a centre of christian sympathy and refinement. Erskine was an accomplished scholar, but next to the Bible his favourite literature was the plays of Shakespeare and the 'Dialogues' of Plato, especially the 'Gorgias.' Erskine devoted much attention to the manifestations produced by Irving's preaching, and spent some weeks in the company of those who were said to possess these gifts. At first he maintained the genuine miraculous character of these utterings, but two years later he expressed his mistrust of them.

During the political troubles of 1848 Erskine held it a duty to remain at home in order to relieve the distress of his own neighbourhood. He found employment for a large number of those out of work, but he viewed with great misgiving the democratic tendencies of modern legislation. In later life Erskine was not seen much out of Scotland, his summers being spent at Linlathen, and his winters in Edinburgh. Erskine survived all his own people, his sister Christian dying in 1866, and his younger sister, David, the widow of Captain Paterson, in 1867. At length, on 20 March 1870, he died quietly and peacefully, with his door open, and his friends coming in and out, as had been his often-expressed wish.

[Letters of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen, edited by W. Hanna, D.D.] W. B.

ERSKINE, THOMAS ALEXANDER, sixth Earl of Kellie (1732–1781), was born 1 Sept. 1732, and succeeded his father, the fifth earl, in 1756. He devoted himself to music, and, going to Germany, studied at Mannheim under the elder Stamitz, with the result that he became a most accomplished player on the violin and a talented composer. Dr. Burney said that he was possessed of more musical science than any dilettante with whom he was ever acquainted (*General Hist. of Music*, iv. 677), and he composed with extraordinary rapidity (Robertson, *Enquiry into the Fine Arts*, pp. 437–8, where Lord Kellie's music is described as characterised by 'loudness, rapidity, and enthusiasm'). 'The musical earl' was for many years the director of the concerts of the St. Cecilia Society at Edinburgh. He died at Brussels unmarried on 9 Oct. 1781.

Lord Kellie's coarse joviality made him one of the best-known men of his time. Foote implied that his rubicund countenance would ripen cucumbers; Dr. Johnson is supposed to have alluded to him in his censure of a certain Scotch lord celebrated for hard drinking (Boswell, ed. Croker, p. 551); and Henry Erskine [q. v.], the lord advocate, made his cousin's habits the subject of numberless jokes and parodies (Fergusson, *Life of Henry Erskine*, pp. 140–6, and a note by the same in *Notes and Queries*, 6th ser. ix. 424). He was compelled to sell in 1769 all his estates except the mansion house of Kellie (Wood, *The East Neuk of Fife*, p. 213). The greater part of his musical compositions is believed to have been lost, though a collection of his charming minuets was published in 1836, with an introductory notice by C. K. Sharpe, and several of his overtures have been preserved. Lord Kellie was also something of a rhymester; but the neat little piece, 'A Lover's Message,' usually attributed to him, has been discovered to have been written before his birth, though he undoubtedly set it to music; and the only genuine production of his that is still in existence is a fragment or two of a lyric piece entitled 'The Kelso Races.'

[Fergusson's Life of Henry Erskine; Sharpe's introductory notice to Lord Kellie's minuets; Douglas's Peerage (Wood), ii. 20; Musical Cat. in Brit. Mus.] L. C. S.

ERSKINE, WILLIAM (*d.* 1685), master of Charterhouse, was the seventh son of John, second or seventh earl of Mar [q. v.], by his second wife, Lady Mary Stewart, daughter of Esme, duke of Lennox. In 1677, on the death of Martin Clifford, he was elected master of Charterhouse, which office he held till his death on 29 May 1685. He was a member of the Royal Society, and his name appears in the list of the first council named in the royal charter, under date 22 April 1663, but he took no active part in the scientific proceedings of the society. He also held the appointment of cupbearer to Charles II.

[Collins's Peerage, ed. Brydges, ix. 264; Douglas and Wood's Peerage of Scotland, ii. 216; Hist. of Colleges of Winchester, Eton, &c., 1816; Royal Society's Lists.] A. V.

ERSKINE, Sir WILLIAM (1769–1813), major-general, was the only son of William Erskine of Torry, Fifeshire, whose father, Colonel the Hon. William Erskine, was deputy governor of Blackness Castle, and elder son of David Erskine, second lord Cardross, by his second wife, Mary, daughter of Sir George Bruce of Carnock. He was born in 1769, entered the army as a cornet in the 15th light dragoons in 1786, and was promoted lieutenant in 1788, and captain on 23 Feb. 1791. He was created a baronet on 21 June 1791, and first saw service in the campaigns of the Duke of York in Flanders in 1793–5. He was one of the officers who saved the Emperor Leopold by their famous

charge with part of the 15th light dragoons at Villiers-en-Couche in May 1793, and received the order of Maria Theresa with them, was promoted major in his regiment in June, and lieutenant-colonel on 14 Dec. 1794. After his return to England he was elected M.P. for the county of Fife in 1796, went on half-pay in 1798, was promoted colonel of the 14th garrison battalion on 1 Jan. 1801, was re-elected M.P. in 1802, and again placed on half-pay in 1803 on the reduction of his battalion. He did not again stand for parliament in 1806, and applied repeatedly for active employment. He was promoted major-general on 25 April 1808, and in the following year joined Lord Wellington's army in the Peninsula, and took command of a brigade of cavalry. Wellington believed him to be an officer of real ability, and when Major-general Robert Craufurd went home invalided from the lines of Torres Vedras he gave Erskine the temporary command of the light division. A more unfortunate choice could not have been made. Erskine was brave to a fault, and his recklessness during the pursuit after Masséna in the spring of 1811 nearly ruined the light division on more than one occasion. At Sabugal, in particular, he launched his battalions at the retreating enemy in a fog, and it was only by the skill of his brigadiers, Barnard and Beckwith, that a great disaster was averted; for when the fog lifted Ney was found with his whole *corps d'armée* in an exceedingly strong position. When Craufurd returned, Erskine was transferred to the command of the cavalry attached to the southern force under the command of Sir Rowland Hill, in succession to General Long. He was selected with Picton, Leith, and Cole for the rank of local lieutenant-general in Spain and in Portugal in September 1811. He commanded Hill's cavalry in his advance on Madrid in 1812 after the victory of Salamanca, and covered his retreat when he had to retire from Andalusia, coincidently with Wellington's retreat from Burgos. Erskine had already shown several signs of insanity during this period, and at last it became so obvious that he was ordered to leave the army. On 14 May 1813 he threw himself from a window in Lisbon, and was killed on the spot. As he died unmarried, his baronetcy of Torry became extinct.

[Burke's Extinct Baronetage; Army Lists; Napier's Peninsular War; Cope's History of the Rifle Brigade; Larpent's Journal in the Peninsula.] H. M. S.

ERSKINE, WILLIAM, Lord Kinneder (1769–1822), friend of Sir Walter Scott, son of the Rev. William Erskine, episcopalian minister of Muthill, Perthshire, was born in 1769. He was educated at the university of Glasgow, and while attending it was boarded in the house of Andrew Macdonald, episcopalian clergyman and author of 'Vimonda,' from whom, according to Lockhart, he derived a strong passion for old English literature. He passed advocate at the Scottish bar 3 July 1790, and became the intimate friend and literary confidant of Scott. In 1792 Erskine, with Scott and other young advocates, formed a class for the study of German. According to Lockhart the companionship of Erskine, owing to his special accomplishments as a classical scholar and acquaintance with the 'severe models of antiquity,' was highly serviceable to Scott as a student of German drama and romance. Lockhart represents him as being mercilessly severe on 'the mingled absurdities and vulgarities of German detail.' It was Erskine who negotiated for Scott's translation of 'Lenore' in 1796. In 1801, while in London, Erskine happened to show the volume to 'Monk' Lewis, who thereupon 'anxiously requested that Scott might be enlisted as a contributor to his miscellany entitled "Tales of Wonder."' Soon after Scott began his great career as an author, he resolved to trust to the detection of minor inaccuracies to two persons only, James Ballantyne and Erskine, the latter being 'the referee whenever the poet hesitated about taking the advice of the zealous typographer.' The friends joined in keeping up the delusion that Erskine and not Scott was the author of the portions of the 'Bridal of Triermain,' and wrote a preface intended to 'throw out the knowing ones.' Scott dedicated to Erskine the third canto of 'Marmion,' which was published in February 1808. Erskine was appointed sheriff depute of Orkney 6 June 1809, and in 1814 Scott accompanied him and other friends on a voyage to those islands (see chaps. xxviii–xxx. vol. ii. of Lockhart's *Life of Scott*). Lockhart ascribes to Erskine the critical estimate of the Waverley novels included in Scott's own notice in the 'Quarterly Review' of 'Old Mortality,' in answer to the sectarian attacks of Dr. Thomas M'Crie against his representation of the covenanters. By Scott's unwearied exertions on his behalf Erskine was in January 1822 promoted to the bench as Lord Kinneder. The charge against him of an improper *liaison*, a groundless and malignant calumny, which Scott said 'would have done honour to the invention of the devil himself,' so seriously affected his health and spirits that, though it was proved to be utterly groundless, he never recovered from the shock caused by the accusation. It 'struck,' said

Scott, 'into his heart and soul;' he became nerveless and despondent, was finally attacked by fever and delirium, and died on 14 Aug. 1822. Lockhart states that he never saw Scott 'in such a state of dejection' as when he accompanied him in attendance upon Kinneder's funeral. Lockhart thinks that Erskine was 'the only man in whose society Scott took great pleasure, during the more vigorous part of his life, that had neither constitution nor inclination for any of the rough bodily exercise in which he himself delighted.' If, as Erskine supposed, Redmond in 'Rokeby' is meant for a portrait of himself, Lockhart must have exaggerated Erskine's effeminacy.

Erskine wrote several Scotch songs, one of which is published in Maidment's 'Court of Session Garland' (1888), p. 110.

Kinneder had two daughters by his wife, Euphemia Robinson, who died in September 1819. She was buried in the churchyard of Saline, Fife, where there is an epitaph on her tombstone written by Scott.

[Haig and Brunton's Senators of the College of Justice; Sir Walter Scott's Works; Lockhart's Life of Scott. A Sketch of Lord Kinneder, by Hay Donaldson, to which Scott contributed some particulars, was printed for private circulation shortly after his death.] T. F. H.

INDEX

TO

THE SEVENTEENTH VOLUME.

PAGE

Edward, Eadward, or Eadweard, called the Elder (*d.* 924) 1
Edward or Eadward the Martyr (963 ?–978) . 5
Edward or Eadward, called the Confessor (*d.* 1066) 7
Edward I (1239–1307) 14
Edward II of Carnarvon (1284–1327) . . 38
Edward III (1312–1377) 48
Edward IV (1442–1483) 70
Edward V (1470–1483) 82
Edward VI (1537–1553) 84
Edward, Prince of Wales, called the Black Prince, and sometimes Edward IV and Edward of Woodstock (1330–1376) . . 90
Edward, Prince of Wales (1453–1471) . . 101
Edward, Earl of Warwick (1475–1499) . . 104
Edward, Dafydd (*d.* 1690). See David, Edward.
Edward, Thomas (1814–1886) 106
Edwardes, Sir Herbert Benjamin (1819–1868) 107
Edwards, Arthur (*d.* 1743) 111
Edwards, Bryan (1743–1800) 111
Edwards, Charles (*d.* 1691 ?) 113
Edwards, Edward (1738–1806) 114
Edwards, Edward (1803–1879) 115
Edwards, Edward (1812–1886) 115
Edwards, Edwin (1823–1879) 117
Edwards, George (1694–1773) 117
Edwards, George, M.D. (1752–1823) . . 118
Edwards, George Nelson, M.D. (1830–1868) . 118
Edwards, Henry Thomas (1837–1884) . . 119
Edwards, Humphrey (*d.* 1658) 119
Edwards, James (1757–1816) 120
Edwards or Edwardes, John, M.D. (*fl.* 1638) . 121
Edwards, John (Sion Treredyn) (*fl.* 1651) . 121
Edwards, John (1637–1716) 121
Edwards, John (Sion y Potiau) (1700 ?–1776) 123
Edwards, John (1714–1785) 123
Edwards, John (Sion Ceiriog) (1747–1792) . 123
Edwards, John (1751–1832) 123
Edwards, Jonathan, D.D. (1629–1712) . . 123
Edwards, Lewis, D.D. (1809–1887) . . . 124
Edwards, Richard (1523 ?–1566) 125
Edwards, Roger, D.D. (1811–1886) . . 125
Edwards, Sydenham Teak (1769 ?–1819) . 126
Edwards, Thomas (*fl.* 1595) 126
Edwards, Thomas (1599–1647) 127
Edwards, Thomas (1652–1721) 128
Edwards, Thomas (1699–1757) 129
Edwards, Thomas (1729–1785) 129
Edwards, Thomas, LL.D. (*fl.* 1810) . . 130
Edwards, Thomas (1775 ?–1845) 130
Edwards, Thomas (Caerfallwch) (1779–1858) 130
Edwards, William (1719–1789) 130
Edwards, William Camden (1777–1855) . . 131
Edwardston, Thomas (*d.* 1396) 131
Edwin or Eadwine (585 ?–633) 132

PAGE

Edwin, Elizabeth Rebecca (1771 ?–1854) . 134
Edwin, Sir Humphrey (1642–1707) . . 135
Edwin, John, the elder (1749–1790) . . 137
Edwin, John, the younger (1768–1805) . . 139
Edwy or Eadwig (*d.* 959) 140
Eedes, John (1609 ?–1667 ?) 141
Eedes, Richard (1555–1604). See Edes.
Eedes, Richard (*d.* 1686) 141
Effingham, Earls of. See Howard.
Egan, James (1799–1842) 141
Egan, John (1750 ?–1810) 142
Egan, Pierce, the elder (1772–1849) . . 142
Egan, Pierce, the younger (1814–1880) . . 144
Egbert or Ecgberht, Saint (639–729) . . 146
Egbert or Ecgberht (*d.* 766) 147
Egbert, Ecgberht, or Ecgbryht (*d.* 839) . . 148
Egerton, Charles Chandler (1798–1885) . . 151
Egerton, Daniel (1772–1835) 151
Egerton, Francis, third and last Duke of Bridgewater (1736–1803) 151
Egerton, Francis, Earl of Ellesmere (1800–1857) 153
Egerton, Francis Henry, eighth Earl of Bridgewater (1756–1829) 154
Egerton, John, first Earl of Bridgewater (1579–1649) 156
Egerton, John, second Earl of Bridgewater (1622–1686) 156
Egerton, John, third Earl of Bridgewater (1646–1701) 157
Egerton, John (1721–1787) 158
Egerton, Sir Philip de Malpas Grey- (1806–1881) 159
Egerton, Sarah (1782–1847) 159
Egerton, Stephen (1555 ?–1621 ?) 160
Egerton, Sir Thomas, Baron Ellesmere and Viscount Brackley (1540 ?–1617) . . 161
Egg, Augustus Leopold (1816–1863) . . 163
Egglesfield, Robert. See Eglesfield.
Eginton, Francis (1737–1805) 164
Eginton, Francis (1775–1823) 165
Eglesfield, Robert of (*d.* 1349) 165
Egley, William (1798–1870) 166
Eglinton, Earls of. See Montgomerie and Seton.
Eglisham, George, M.D. (*fl.* 1612–1642) . 166
Egmont, Earls of. See Percival.
Egremont, Baron and Earl of. See Wyndham.
Ehret, Georg Dionysius (1710–1770) . . 167
Eineon (*fl.* 1093) 167
Ekins, Sir Charles (1768–1855) . . . 168
Ekins, Jeffery, D.D. (*d.* 1791) 169
Elchies, Lord. See Grant, Patrick (1690–1754).
Eld, George (1791–1862) 169
Elder, Charles (1821–1851) 170
Elder, Edward (1812–1858) 170

PAGE
Elder, John (*fl.* 1555) 170
Elder, John (1824–1869) 171
Elder, Thomas (1737–1799) 172
Elder, William (*fl.* 1680–1700) . . . 172
Elderfield, Christopher (1607–1652) . . 172
Elderton, William (*d.* 1592 ?) 173
Eldin, Lord. See Clerk, John (1757–1832).
Eldon, Earl of. See Scott, John (1751–1838).
Eldred, John (1552–1632) 174
Eldred, Thomas (*fl.* 1586–1622) . . . 175
Eldred, William (*fl.* 1646) 175
Eleanor, Alienor, or Ænor, Duchess of Aquitaine, Queen of France and Queen of England (1122 ?–1204) 175
Eleanor of Castile (*d.* 1290) 178
Eleanor of Provence (*d.* 1291) 179
Elers, John Philip (*fl.* 1690–1730) . . . 180
Elfleda or Ælflæd (654–714 ?). See under Eanflæd (*b.* 626).
Elfleda (*d.* 918 ?). See Ethelfleda.
Elford, Richard (*d.* 1714) 181
Elford, Sir William (1749–1837) . . . 182
Elgin, Earls of. See Bruce, James, eighth earl (1811–1863); Bruce, Robert, second earl (*d.* 1685); Bruce, Thomas, third earl (1655 ?–1741); Bruce, Thomas, seventh earl (1766–1841).
Elgiva. See Ælfgifu (*fl.* 956).
Elias, John (1774–1841) 182
Elibank, Lords. See Murray.
Eliot. See also Eliott, Elliot, Elliott, and Elyot.
Eliot, Edward, Lord Eliot (1727–1804) . . 184
Eliot, Edward Granville, third Earl of St. Germans (1798–1877) 185
Eliot, Francis Perceval (1756 ?–1818) . . 186
Eliot, George. See Cross, Mary Ann.
Eliot, Sir John (1592–1632) 186
Eliot, John (1604–1690) 189
Eliot, Sir Thomas (1490 ?–1546). See Elyot.
Eliott, Sir Daniel (1798–1872) 194
Eliott, George Augustus, Lord Heathfield (1717–1790) 195
Elizabeth, Queen of Edward IV (1437 ?–1492) 196
Elizabeth, Queen of Henry VII (1465–1503) . 200
Elizabeth, Queen of England (1533–1603) . 203
Elizabeth, Princess (1635–1650) . . . 232
Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia (1596–1662) . 233
Elizabeth, Princess of England and Landgravine of Hesse-Homburg (1770–1840) . 240
Elkington, George Richards (1801–1865) . 240
Elkington, Henry (1810–1852). See under Elkington, George Richards.
Ella. See Ælla.
Ella, John (1802–1888) 241
Ellacombe or Ellicombe, Henry Thomas (1790–1885) 242
Ellenborough, Lord and Earl of. See Law, Edward.
Ellerker, Sir Ralph (*d.* 1546) 243
Ellerker, Thomas (1738–1795) 243
Ellerton, Edward, D.D. (1770–1851) . . 244
Ellerton, John Lodge, formerly John Lodge (1801–1873) 244
Ellesmere, Baron. See Egerton, Sir Thomas (1540 ?–1617).
Ellesmere, Earl of. See Egerton, Francis (1800–1857).
Elley, Sir John (*d.* 1839) 245
Ellice, Edward, the elder (1781–1863) . . 246
Ellice, Edward, the younger (1810–1880) . 247
Ellicombe. See also Ellacombe.
Ellicombe, Sir Charles Grene (1783–1871) . 248
PAGE
Ellicott, John (1706 ?–1772) 249
Ellicott, Edward (*d.* 1791). See under Ellicott, John.
Elliot. See also Eliot, Eliott, and Elliott.
Elliot, Adam (*d.* 1700) 250
Elliot, Sir Charles (1801–1875) . . . 251
Elliot, Sir George (1784–1863) . . . 251
Elliot, Sir Gilbert, Lord Minto (1651–1718) . 252
Elliot, Sir Gilbert, Lord Minto (1693–1766) . 253
Elliot, Sir Gilbert, third baronet of Minto (1722–1777) 253
Elliot, Sir Gilbert, first Earl of Minto (1751–1814) 255
Elliot, Gilbert, second Earl of Minto (1782–1859) 257
Elliot, Sir Henry Miers (1808–1853) . . 258
Elliot, Hugh (1752–1830) 259
Elliot, Jane or Jean (1727–1805) . . . 259
Elliot, John (1725–1782) 260
Elliot, John (*d.* 1808) 261
Elliot or Sheldon, Nathaniel (1705–1780) . 262
Elliot, Robert (*fl.* 1822–1833) . . . 262
Elliot, Sir Walter (1803–1887) . . . 262
Elliotson, John (1791–1868) 264
Elliott. See also Eliot, Eliott, and Elliot.
Elliott, Charlotte (1789–1871) . . . 266
Elliott, Ebenezer (1781–1849) 266
Elliott, Edward Bishop (1793–1875) . . 268
Elliott, Grace Dalrymple (1758 ?–1823) . . 268
Elliott, Henry Venn (1792–1865) . . . 269
Elliott, John, M.D. (*fl.* 1690) 270
Elliott, Sir John, M.D. (1736–1786) . . 270
Elliott or Elliot, William (1727–1766) . . 271
Elliott, William (*d.* 1792) 271
Elliott, Sir William Henry (1792–1874) . . 272
Ellis, Anthony (1690–1761). See Ellys.
Ellis, Arthur Ayres (1830–1887) . . . 272
Ellis, Sir Barrow Helbert (1823–1887) . . 272
Ellis, Charles Augustus, Lord Howard de Walden and Seaford (1799–1868) . . 273
Ellis, Charles Rose, first Lord Seaford (1771–1845) 274
Ellis, Clement (1630–1700) 274
Ellis, Rev. Edmund (*fl.* 1707). See Elys.
Ellis, Edwin (1844–1878) 275
Ellis, Francis Whyte (*d.* 1819) . . . 276
Ellis, George (1753–1815) 276
Ellis, George James Welbore Agar-, first Baron Dover (1797–1833) 277
Ellis, Henry (1721–1806) 278
Ellis, Sir Henry (1777–1855) 279
Ellis, Sir Henry (1777–1869) 280
Ellis, Sir Henry Walton (1783–1815) . . 282
Ellis, Humphrey, D.D. (*d.* 1676) . . . 282
Ellis, James (1763 ?–1830) 283
Ellis, John (1599 ?–1665) 283
Ellis, John (1606 ?–1681) 283
Ellis, John (1643 ?–1738) 284
Ellis, John (1701–1757). See Ellys.
Ellis, John (1710 ?–1776) 285
Ellis, John (1698–1790) 286
Ellis, John (1789–1862) 287
Ellis, Philip, in religion Michael (1652–1726) 287
Ellis, Sir Richard (1688 ?–1742). See Ellys.
Ellis, Robert (Cynddelw) (1810–1875) . . 289
Ellis, Robert (1820 ?–1885) 289
Ellis, Robert Leslie (1817–1859) . . . 290
Ellis, Sir Samuel Burdon (1787–1865) . . 290
Ellis, Sarah Stickney. See under Ellis, William (1795–1872).
Ellis, Thomas (1625–1673) 291
Ellis, Thomas Flower (1796–1861) . . . 291

PAGE
Ellis, Welbore (1651?–1734) 292
Ellis, Welbore, first Baron Mendip (1713–1802) 292
Ellis, Sir William (1609–1680) . . . 294
Ellis, Sir William (*d.* 1732) 295
Ellis, William (1747–1810) 295
Ellis, William (*d.* 1758) 295
Ellis, William (1794–1872) 296
Ellis, William (1800–1881) 298
Ellis, Wynne (1790–1875) 298
Elliston, Henry Twiselton (1801?–1864) . 299
Elliston, Robert William (1774–1831) . . 299
Ellman, John (1753–1832) 302
Ellwood, Thomas (1639–1713) . . . 303
Ellys, Anthony (1690–1761) 306
Ellys or Ellis, John (1701–1757) . . . 306
Ellys, Sir Richard (1688?–1742) . . . 307
Elmer. See Ethelmaer.
Elmer, John. See Aylmer, John (1521–1594).
Elmer, Stephen (*d.* 1796) 308
Elmer, William (*fl.* 1799). See under Elmer, Stephen.
Elmes, Harvey Lonsdale (1813–1847) . . 308
Elmes, James (1782–1862) 308
Elmham, Thomas (*d.* 1440?) 309
Elmore, Alfred (1815–1881) 309
Elmsley or Elmsly, Peter (1736–1802) . . 310
Elmsley, Peter (1773–1825) 310
Elphege (954–1012). See Ælfheah.
Elphinston, James (1721–1809) . . . 311
Elphinston, John (1722–1785) . . . 312
Elphinstone, Alexander, fourth Lord Elphinstone (1552–1648?) 314
Elphinstone, Arthur, sixth Lord Balmerino (1688–1746) 314
Elphinstone, George Keith, Viscount Keith (1746–1823) 316
Elphinstone, Hester Maria, Viscountess Keith (1762–1857) 321
Elphinstone, Sir Howard (1773–1846) . . 321
Elphinstone, James, first Lord Balmerino (1553?–1612) 322
Elphinstone, John, second Lord Balmerino (*d.* 1649) 323
Elphinstone, John, third Lord Balmerino (1623–1704). See under Elphinstone, John (*d.* 1649).
Elphinstone, John, fourth Lord Balmerino (1682–1736). See under Elphinstone, John (*d.* 1649).
Elphinstone, John, thirteenth Lord Elphinstone (1807–1860) 325
Elphinstone, Margaret Mercer, Comtesse de Flahault, Viscountess Keith, and Baroness Nairne (1788–1867) 325
Elphinstone, Mountstuart (1779–1859) . . 326
Elphinstone, William (1431–1514) . . . 328
Elphinstone, William George Keith (1782–1842) 330
Elrington, Charles Richard (1787–1850) . 331
Elrington, Thomas (1688–1732) . . . 332
Elrington, Thomas, D.D. (1760–1835) . . 333
Elsdale, Robinson (1744–1783) . . . 334
Elsdale, Samuel (*d.* 1827). See under Elsdale, Robinson.
Elstob, Elizabeth (1683–1756) 334
Elstob, William (1673–1715) 335
Elstracke, Renold (Renier) (*fl.* 1590–1630) . 336
Elsum, John (*fl.* 1700–1705) 336
Elsynge, Henry (1598–1654) 336
Elton, Sir Charles Abraham (1778–1853) . 337
Elton, Edward William (1794–1843) . . 337
Elton, James Frederic (1840–1877) . . 338
PAGE
Elton, Richard (*fl.* 1650) 339
Elvey, Stephen (1805–1860) 339
Elviden, Edmund (*fl.* 1570) 340
Elwall, Edward (1676–1744) 340
Elwes, Sir Gervase (*d.* 1615). See Helwys.
Elwes or Meggott, John (1714–1789) . . 542
Ely, Humphrey, LL.D. (*d.* 1604) . . . 344
Ely, Nicholas of (*d.* 1280) 344
Ely, William (*d.* 1609) 346
Elyot, Sir Richard (1450?–1522) . . . 347
Elyot, Sir Thomas (1490?–1546) . . . 347
Elys, Edmund (*fl.* 1707) 350
Emerson, William (1701–1782) . . . 351
Emery, Edward (*d.* 1850?) 352
Emery, John (1777–1822) 352
Emery, Samuel Anderson (1817–1881) . . 353
Emes, John (*fl.* 1785–1805) 354
Emes, Thomas (*d.* 1707) 354
Emily, Edward, M.D. (1617–1657) . . . 355
Emlyn, Sollom (1697–1754) 355
Emlyn, Henry (1729–1815) 355
Emlyn, Thomas (1663–1741) 356
Emma, called Ælfgifu (*d.* 1052) . . . 360
Emmet, Christopher Temple (1761–1788) . 361
Emmet, Robert (1778–1803) 362
Emmet, Thomas Addis (1764–1827) . . 363
Emmett, Anthony (1790–1872) . . . 364
Empson or Emson, Sir Richard (*d.* 1510) . 364
Empson, William (1791–1852) . . . 365
Enda, or, in the older spelling, Enna, Saint, of Arran (*fl.* 6th cent.) 365
Endecott, John (1588?–1665) . . . 366
Enfield, Edward (1811–1880) 368
Enfield, William (1741–1797) 369
England, George (*fl.* 1735) 370
England, George (*fl.* 1740–1788) . . . 370
England, George Pike (1765?–1814). See under England, George (*fl.* 1740–1788).
England, John, D.D. (1786–1842) . . . 370
England, Sir Richard (1793–1883) . . . 371
England, Thomas Richard (1790–1847) . . 372
Englefield, Sir Francis (*d.* 1596?) . . . 372
Englefield, Sir Henry Charles (1752–1822) . 374
Engleheart, Francis (1775–1849) . . . 375
Engleheart, Timothy Stansfeld (1803–1879). See under Engleheart, Francis.
Engleheart, George (1752–1839) . . . 375
Engleheart, John Cox Dillman (1783–1862). See under Engleheart, George.
Engleheart, Thomas (*d.* 1787?) . . . 375
English, Hester. See Inglis.
English, Sir John Hawker, M.D. (1788–1840) 376
English, Josias (*d.* 1718?) 376
English, William (*d.* 1778) 376
Ensom, William (1796–1832) 376
Ensor, George (1769–1843) 376
Ent, Sir George, M.D. (1604–1689) . . . 377
Entick, John (1703?–1773) 378
Entwisle, Joseph (1767–1841) 378
Enty, John (1675?–1743) 379
Eoghan, Saint and Bishop (*d.* 618) . . 379
Eon, Chevalier d'. See D'Eon de Beaumont.
Epine, Francesca Margherita de l' (*d.* 1746) . 380
Epps, George Napoleon (1815–1874) . . 381
Epps, John (1805–1869) 382
Erard, Saint and Bishop (*fl.* 730–754) . . 383
Erbury, William (1604–1654) . . . 383
Erceldoune, Thomas of, called also the 'Rhymer' and 'Learmont' (*fl.* 1220?–1297?) 385
Erdeswicke, Sampson (*d.* 1603) . . . 388
Erigena, John Scotus (*d.* 875). See Scotus.

PAGE
Erkenwald or Earconwald, Saint (*d.* 693) . 390
Erle, Thomas (1650 ?–1720) 391
Erle, Sir William (1793–1880) . . . 392
Ernest, Augustus, Duke of York and Albany (1674–1728) 393
Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland and King of Hanover (1771–1851) . . . 393
Ernulf or Arnulf (1040–1124) 396
Errington, Anthony, D.D. (*d.* 1719 ?) . . 398
Errington, George (1804–1886) . . . 398
Errington, John Edward (1806–1862) . . 399
Errington, William (1716–1768) . . . 399
Errol, eighth Earl of (*d.* 1631). See Hay, Francis.
Erskine, Charles (1680–1763) 400
Erskine, James (1722–1796). See under Erskine, Charles.
Erskine, David, second Lord Cardross (1616–1671) 400
Erskine, David, Lord Dun (1670–1758) . . 401
Erskine, Sir David (1772–1837) . . . 401
Erskine, David Montagu, second Lord Erskine (1776–1855) 401
Erskine, David Steuart, eleventh Earl of Buchan (1742–1829) 402
Erskine, Ebenezer (1680–1754) . . . 404
Erskine, Edward Morris (1817–1883) . . 407
Erskine, Henry, third Lord Cardross (1650–1693) 408
PAGE
Erskine, Henry (1624–1696) 409
Erskine, Sir Henry or Harry (*d.* 1765) . . 409
Erskine, Henry (1746–1817) 410
Erskine, James, sixth Earl of Buchan (*d.* 1640) 412
Erskine, James, Lord Grange (1679–1754) . 413
Erskine, Sir James St. Clair, second Earl of Rosslyn (1762–1837) 414
Erskine, John, sixth Lord Erskine, and first or sixth Earl of Mar of the Erskine line (*d.* 1572) 416
Erskine, John (1509–1591) 419
Erskine, John, second or seventh Earl of Mar in the Erskine line (1558–1634) . . . 422
Erskine, John, sixth or eleventh Earl of Mar of the Erskine line (1675–1732) . . . 426
Erskine, John (1695–1768) 431
Erskine, John, D.D. (1721 ?–1803) . . . 432
Erskine, Ralph (1685–1752) 433
Erskine, Thomas, first Earl of Kellie (1566–1639) 434
Erskine, Thomas, Lord (1750–1823) . . 435
Erskine, Thomas (1788–1864) 443
Erskine, Thomas (1788–1870) 444
Erskine, Thomas Alexander, sixth Earl of Kellie (1732–1781) 445
Erskine, William (*d.* 1685) 445
Erskine, Sir William (1769–1813) . . . 445
Erskine, William, Lord Kinneder (1769–1822) 446

END OF THE SEVENTEENTH VOLUME.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

31375

MILLS COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 3086 00183 8390